1-1-1992

An analysis of multiracial change efforts in student affairs.

Raechele L. Pope
University of Massachusetts Amherst

AN ANALYSIS OF MULTIRACIAL CHANGE EFFORTS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

A Dissertation Presented

by

RAECHELE L. POPE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 1992

School of Education

AN ANALYSIS OF MULTIRACIAL CHANGE EFFORTS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

A Dissertation Proposal Presented

by

RAECHELE L. POPE

Approved as to style and content by:

Bailey W. Jackson, Chair

Pat Griffin, Member

Rita Hardiman, Member

Leila V. Moore, Member

Bailey W. Jackson, Dean
School of Education

This is for Amy -- as simple as that

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have often wondered why the acknowledgements for publications, especially dissertations, are so long. Now I know. Preparing this manuscript was not an easy task, nor was it really accomplished alone. There are many people who must be publicly acknowledged, for their assistance and support.

I would first like to thank my Dissertation Committee: Bailey W. Jackson, Advisor and Chair, and members Pat Griffin, Rita Hardiman, and Leila V. Moore. Your support has been appreciated. A special thank you to Leila for agreeing to serve on the Committee and be the lone Student Affairs voice. Your expertise and your willingness to do this even though you were miles away at Penn State and in the middle of your ACPA Presidency marathon was a true gift.

I owe special thanks to the University of Iowa Statistical Consulting Center for a generous research grant to support this study. Special mention must go to Ron Bosch, Statistical Consultant, who was readily available (even during vacations) to provide expertise, support, and encouragement. In addition, Dr. Audrey Qualls-Payne, a University of Iowa test construction expert provided needed assistance with the development of the questionnaire. ACPA - Commission 1 provided a generous Research Award for the support of this study. NASPA provided the mailing labels necessary to conduct this study.

Harold Cheatham, from Pennsylvania State University, deserves special recognition. Thank you for your suggestions, encouragement, and conscientious editing. You are my mentor. I greatly respect you and am honored by all you have done.

My UMASS Dissertation Support Group was a true gift from the Universe -- these were the folks who made this task seem doable, at times even enjoyable. Steve Goldberg, Thank you for allowing me to learn from your process. Eileen Conlon, our talks kept me feeling centered and helped me realize that everything was gonna be alright. Tom Landis-Schiff, throughout this process you have been my touchstone. Yes, you are my brother--I am your sister.

There are many friends at UMASS who have provided the much needed support and encouragement as I completed this process. Deb Levy -- ain't no doubt about it she's my homegirl, Linda Marchesani, Andrea Kandel, Paulette Dalpes, and Kathy Obear.

John Mueller, Tim and Bette Cotto-Ecklund, and Nancy Speirs, have over the years and across the miles sent their love, their challenges, their support, and the much needed laughter. Finally I must thank Amy L. Reynolds. Her generous and loving spirit has made this process and this product possible. To the end of my days I will try to be as good for her as she is for me. I celebrate our life together.

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF MULTIRACIAL CHANGE EFFORTS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS

SEPTEMBER 1992

RAECHELE L. POPE, B.A., INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

M.A., INDIANA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Ed.D, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Directed by: Associate Professor, BAILEY W. JACKSON

Student affairs divisions at colleges and universities across the nation are currently implementing a variety of programmatic responses to develop multiracial campus environments. The purpose of this study was to identify and examine the multiracial change efforts currently utilized by student affairs administrators.

This study surveyed 225 Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs) using a specially designed questionnaire which assessed the levels and types of multiracial change efforts utilized on individual campuses. A conceptual model, Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix (MCIM), based on the concepts of multicultural organization development (MCOD), provided a framework for codifying and understanding the range of activities that student affairs divisions currently use to address multiracial issues.

A total of 126 questionnaires (56%) were returned. Over 70% of the respondents were from schools with 10,000

students or less. The range of multiracial interventions reported was 0-300. Nearly 60% of the respondents reported offering five or fewer multiracial interventions during the past two years. There were no significant differences found in the frequency of interventions across institutional size or region.

Using the MCIM for analysis, student affairs divisions instituted an almost equal number of 1st- and 2nd-order changes targeted at both the individual and group level. However, student affairs practioners attempted fewer 2nd-order than 1st-order change interventions targeted at the division level. Only six respondents utilized MCOD strategies as the basis of their multiracial change efforts.

While additional work needs to be done with the underlying model (MCIM) and the questionnaire designed for this study, this research has provided an initial and important step in understanding the multiracial interventions currently utilized in student affairs. Gathering this type of information is crucial in order for student affairs administrators to make informed and effective decisions about what interventions will help create affirming and inclusive multiracial campus environments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Equity and access for White women and people of color have been on the agenda of most college and university administrators for at least the past two decades (Conrad & Shrode, 1990). Equity issues in higher education center around creating campus environments free from bias and discrimination. Access issues involve the elimination of institutional barriers which deny admission to certain groups. Proposed responses to these issues are myriad (Council for the Advancement of Standards [CAS], 1986; Evans, 1985; Green, 1989; Woolbright, 1989; Wright, 1987). They vary from campus to campus and in many cases from department to department. The results are, at best, uneven (Cheatham, 1991). For example, while enrollment of White women has increased during the past fifteen years, enrollment and retention of women and men of color has declined steadily (American Association of State College and Universities [AASCU], 1986; Adolphus, 1984; Benderson, 1988; Carter, 1990; Cox & Matthews, 1988; Davila, 1988; Evans, 1985; Hall & Sandler, 1982; National Center for Education Statistics, 1988; Smith, 1989). Despite fluctuations in enrollments, "sheer numbers alone have not been sufficient to bring about substantive change in programs, practices,

and policies" Jacoby, 1991, p. 296). Responses to equity issues and attempts to eliminate bias have also yielded dissatisfying results.

The prevailing gender and racial[1] climate of colleges and universities is inimical to the creation of multicultural campuses where full gender and racial diversity participation would be realized. Instead students of color and White female students report feeling alienated from the campus; they describe the campus environment as unwelcoming, at best, and often hostile (Astin, 1982; Fleming, 1982; 1985; Freeman, 1975; Edwards, 1983; Pope, Ecklund, Mueller, & Reynolds, 1990; Wright, 1987). They experience discrimination, hostility, anger, and even violence on college and university campuses (Freeman, 1975; Reynolds, Lustgraaf, & Bogar, 1989; Reynolds, Roark, Shang, & Stevens, 1988).

Peer harassment (i.e., group harassment, sexual harassment, academic harassment, pestering and street harassment) of women on college campuses is also a prevalent occurrence (O'Gorman & Sandler, 1989). Further, one in four college women surveyed reported an experience that met the legal definition of rape (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987).

---

[1] Although there is current and continuing debate surrounding the definitions of the terms race and ethnicity and the debate centered around the entire concept of race as an accurate or even helpful category, I have reluctantly chosen to use the term race for the purposes of this paper for the sake of clarity and to conform to common usage.

Additionally, reports of racially motivated bias and violence against students of color on predominately white campuses have increased significantly over the past several years (Iasenza & Troutt, 1990; Rappoport, 1988; Steele, 1989; Terrell, 1989). In response to these incidents, students of color and white female students have expressed discontent and outrage on campuses across the nation (Rappoport, 1988). Clearly, these experiences negatively affect students' emotional well-being and the hostile and insensitive environments heighten these student's potential for academic risk (Wright, 1987).

In higher education student affairs professionals have been in the forefront of the quest to create more welcoming and affirming campus environments and have often been called upon to address the discontent and outrage of students who have experienced an alienating and hostile campus climate. Their responses exemplify the earliest functions of student affairs professionals which included supporting and serving the needs of students outside of the classroom (Hood and Arceneaux, 1990). In these capacities, student affairs professionals have long championed concerns of equity and access in higher education.

In recent years, student affairs divisions at colleges and universities across the nation have devoted increasing attention to cultural diversity issues. This increasing concern is evidenced in the growing number of published

articles, conference presentations, and topical symposia on multicultural issues. The frequently cited changing demographic forecast for the 1990s and beyond (Hodgkinson, 1983; 1984; 1986; Levine, 1989), is one of the great motivators for this concern. Other motivators include escalating bias-related harassment and violence, the ever-expanding number of groups on campus demanding inclusion, fear of legal and/or political battles as well as a sincere desire to create campuses which are humane.

Despite the increasing concern for multicultural issues within the student affairs profession, there is a paucity of literature discussing, evaluating, and codifying the multicultural interventions or change strategies used in student affairs. One reason for this lack of literature may be the fact that professionals in student affairs are primarily practitioners. Practitioners are less likely either to be obliged or disposed to engage in comprehensive research and publishing. Of the material that is published, the vast majority is theoretical, or of the reflective commentary nature, specific to a particular campus, and lacking in rigor, and generalizability.

Attention to cultural diversity issues has prompted the initiation of a variety of programmatic responses in student affairs. Typically these responses have attempted to address cultural diversity or multicultural issues through the use of individual racial awareness or consciousness

raising activities. Many of these interventions, however, are narrow in scope and overlook such cultural diversity issues as sexual orientation and gender. Although these efforts are valuable, particularly on a individual basis, they have had little effect on the structure and day-to-day functioning of an institution. According to Jacoby (1991), "...institutional responses to the increased presence of different groups of students have generally been fragmented attempts to deal with immediate, specific problems rather than long-range and comprehensive" (p. 296). As the planned change theories and social justice change literatures suggest, long term change in institutions requires that the interventions focus on the organization as a system (Alderfer, 1977; Argyris, 1970; Barr & Strong, 1989; Cummings & Huse, 1989; Foster, Jackson, Cross, Jackson, & Hardiman, 1988; Jackson & Holvino, 1988; Jamison, 1978; Katz, 1989; Katz & Miller, 1988; Katz & Torres, 1985; Owens, 1987; Sargent, 1983; Schmuck & Miles, 1971).

The suggestion that student affairs utilize systemic change interventions is not new. Since at least the early 1970s, student affairs scholars and practitioners have recommended the incorporation of systemic change interventions and, in particular, organization development techniques (Blaesser 1978; Borland, 1980; Conyne, 1991; Creamer & Creamer, 1986; Crookston & Blaesser, 1962; Kurpius, 1980; Strange, 1981). Organization development

(OD) was viewed as a means not only of assisting student affairs divisions in becoming more effective and efficient in their work but was also seen as a means for transforming the structure of existing student affairs divisions in order to incorporate the then fledgling philosophy of student development into the mainstream of the profession (Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980; Miller & Prince, 1976).

In addition to the lack of systemic change efforts oriented towards multicultural issues, student affairs, like many organizations, has not fully included the oppression or social justice agenda in their efforts to create multicultural campus environments. Many campuses have chosen to focus almost exclusively on cultural diversity or "civility" issues rather than the foundation issues of, for example, racism, sexism, or classism (Barr & Strong, 1989; B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990).

Although some student affairs divisions have made extensive efforts in addressing multicultural issues, many of the efforts are sporadic and not part of a coordinated and thought-out plan and little has been done in the area of evaluating those multicultural efforts. As well, there is little consensus surrounding 1) how to reach final goals and 2) how to determine when the goals have been achieved. In order to create multicultural campuses, the goals must be clearly specified and plans must be developed which detail

how to achieve those goals. As well, more intensive planning and visioning must occur. Utilizing a method of systemic planned change efforts to create multicultural campuses may assist not only with the necessary visioning but also will identify methods of implementation.

For student affairs divisions to fully confront multicultural issues on campus, systemic approaches are needed which adequately address both the structure of the organization and the underlying social justice agenda (Barr & Strong, 1989; B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990; Katz, 1989). Multicultural organization development (MCOD) provides a framework for large-scale, long-term multicultural systems change and addresses social justice and social diversity issues (Driscoll, 1990; Foster, et al., 1988; Jackson & Holvino, 1988).

An additional problem for those seeking to create multicultural campus environments is that there is no single or broadly accepted definition of the term multicultural and no unified vision of what a multicultural campus environment would entail. Hence, individuals may be using the same words and yet have very different ideas about what is to be accomplished and how. For example, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA) has a Standing Committee for Multicultural Affairs (CMA) which only addresses the issues of people of color. In reality, CMA, is actually a standing

committee for multiracial concerns. Other standing committees have been created within ACPA to address the issues of other targeted groups (e.g., women or lesbian, gay, and bisexual people). Conversely, a recent publication entitled, *Valuing diversity on campus: A multicultural approach*, is more inclusive in its use of the term multicultural by covering a range of diverse groups such as students of color and gay and lesbian students.

Although the same term "multicultural" is used in these two different situations, in actuality, it means very different things. Confusion, misunderstanding, and exclusion are often the results of different uses of these words. Questions of which groups to include, to what degree, and how to include them abound. Some authors are beginning to address these definitional problems (American College Unions-International, [ACU-I] 1987; Pope and Reynolds, 1990). Pope and Reynolds, in their call for a broader use of the term "multicultural", state that, "...in addition to responding to racial and ethnic concerns, the term multicultural can and should be inclusive of other groups such as the common experiences of gay, lesbian, and bisexual people, women, and people with disabilities" (p. 2).

The broadest possible use of the word "multicultural" seems warranted as additional groups express feeling unwelcomed, ignored, disempowered, alienated, or unsafe on

college campuses. A quick perusal through the Chronicle of Higher Education on almost any given week demonstrates the daily realities of these groups (e.g., "Anti-semitic Incident," 1991; Heller, 1990; Jaschik, 1991; Lawrence, 1989; Magner, 1990; 1991; Mangan, 1991; "Minority Students," 1991; Wilson, 1991; Wong, 1990). Numerous articles cite hate speech/free speech debates on campuses, biased-related violence, and the formation of both white and heterosexual student groups. In addition, the clamor for the academic support of cultural diversity by the forming and/or strengthening of ethnic studies, women studies, and gay, lesbian, and bisexual studies is growing. Controversy surrounding benefits for the partners of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students and employees of college and universities is also reported in the literature (cf. The Chronicle of Higher Education).

The full range of these multicultural issues (race, gender, sexual orientation, class, abilities- physical or developmental, religion, age, ethnicity, language) demands attention, however, the lack of available literature on multicultural change efforts in student affairs on issues other than race makes this a particularly arduous task for a dissertation. In an effort to address this concern, this paper is selectively focused on multicultural issues specifically as they relate to race. This focus is intended

to develop a generalizable schema for addressing multicultural issue.

When discussing the relevant literature, unless otherwise noted the terms multiracial and multicultural will be used interchangeably in conformance with their use in the original source. However, when discussing the specific study proposed in this paper, the more accurate and specific term multiracial will be used to connote the focus on student affairs interventions as they relate to racial issues.

Statement of the Problem

Multiracial change efforts have been carried out in individual campus student affairs divisions, however, little is known about the goals, content, and outcome of those interventions. There is a dearth of both descriptive and evaluation research studying these change efforts. The existing literature tends to describe individual campus change efforts which provides little generalizability to other campuses. In addition, such efforts typically focus solely on changing individuals without examining whether the campus environment also might need to change. There are few published studies which examine the creation of multicultural campus environments from an organizational or systems point of view. Such systemic efforts will provide the student affairs profession with an understanding of additional elements necessary to develop multicultural

environments. Without this kind of information, it is increasingly difficult to make informed and effective decisions about what interventions will help create a multicultural campus environment.

Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to identify and examine multiracial change efforts (e.g. programs, activities, recruitment strategies, or other interventions designed to address multiracial issues on campus) currently utilized by student affairs professionals on college and university campuses. This study offers a conceptual model that provides a framework for classifying and understanding the range of activities that student affairs divisions currently use to address specific multiracial issues. Furthermore, this framework demonstrates the utility of MCOD concepts to the work of student affairs.

This study attempts to answer several important questions. The methodology used assesses the frequency of multiracial interventions in students affairs divisions as well as the target of change (e.g., individual, group, institutional) for those interventions. More specifically, using the notions of first and second order change (Lyddon, 1990) which are described in more depth in Chapter Two, this study explores the type and frequency of multiracial student affairs interventions. Finally, this study attempts to

assess whether MCOD strategies are being used currently in student affairs.

Significance of the Study

According to Barr and Strong (1989) and Manning and Coleman-Boatwright (1991), the multicultural interventions currently being utilized on college campuses focus on the level of racial/ethnic awareness of individuals and do not target institutional structures (Stewart, 1991). However accurate that assumption may be, no empirical evidence has been provided to support those statements. To date, no published study has been conducted to provide a national and factual view of multicultural interventions designed by student affairs practitioners. This study provides data to take us beyond assumptions.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions will be utilized throughout this dissertation.

Student Affairs - one of the primary administrative subdivisions within higher education in the United States (like academic affairs). The terms student affairs and student affairs divisions will be used interchangeably in this paper. The student affairs professional is responsible for the tasks in functional areas such as counseling, housing, advising student organizations, career planning and placement, leadership development, and coordinating student

activities (Barr, Keating, & Associates, 1985; Rentz & Saddlemire, 1988).

Student Development - in practice, student development is most often a multifaceted collection of developmental theories which describe and define developmental tasks or experiences of college students as well as influence policy and educational efforts and interventions. According to Brown and Barr (1990), student development theories assist colleges and universities address the needs of students holistically. Theory focuses on the full development of students in terms of such areas as intellectual capabilities, career development, personal ethics, social responsibility, self-awareness, spiritual development, and interpersonal relationships.

Multicultural[2] - a commitment to create an openness to all diverse cultures and people and to eradicate social injustice. It is also a genuine effort to recognize, accept, and celebrate human diversity. The relevant literature almost exclusively defines this word in terms of race. Therefore, when reporting and describing the current literature, its language and popular usage will be utilized. When referring to this author's perspective, the term

---

[2]This definition has been greatly influenced by the work and writings of Bailey Jackson, Rita Hardiman, Judith Katz, Audre Lorde, The Women Against Racism Committee of Iowa City, IA, and Amy L. Reynolds.

multicultural will be used in its most inclusive form as defined above.

Multicultural Campus Environment - a college or university environment in which great attention, time, and resources (e.g., monetary, human) have been dedicated to creating an openness to all diverse cultures and people, and to eradicating social injustice. This commitment is evidenced, for example, through such conventions as an inclusive mission statement and anti-discrimination policy, extensive recruitment and retention efforts which support a multicultural vision, a multicultural curriculum, programs and activities that create an awareness and celebrate diverse cultures, values, and people.

Social Justice - a condition that allows for and promotes equal and fair treatment for all members of society. The existence of oppression (racism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, religious oppression, classism, and ageism) limits and disallows true social justice to occur and therefore, any discussion of social justice inherently must focus on the social, political, institutional, and economic barriers created by oppression.

Oppression - the definition offered by Jackson and Hardiman (1986) will be used in this paper.

> Oppression is a systematic social phenomenon based on the differences between social groups that involves ideological domination, institutional control, and the promulgation of the oppressor group's ideology, logic system and culture on the oppressed group. The result is the exploitation

> of one social group by another for its own benefit, real or perceived. Oppression is not merely an ideology or set of beliefs (prejudices) that assert one groups' superiority over another. Nor is it random or isolated acts of discrimination or harassment toward members of a subordinated group. It is a *system* of domination with many interlocking parts that are mutually reinforcing (p.4).

Social Group - The definition offered by Hardiman and Jackson (1986) will be used in this paper. "A group of people bounded or defined by a social characteristic such as race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, physical or mental capacity, age, class, etc" (p.1).

Outline of the Remainder of the Dissertation

In Chapter Two the origins and current status of student affairs are examined. A review of selected organization development literature found within the student affairs literature also is conducted, which includes an exploration of the use of organization development praxis in student affairs. The integration of MCOD into the work of student affairs as well as key MCOD concepts and perspectives is examined including a discussion of the implications of MCOD in student affairs. This backdrop of information on OD and MCOD further clarifies and conceptualizes the dynamics of the multicultural change efforts in student affairs. Additionally, an analytic model is designed and offered in this dissertation that provides a framework for codifying and understanding the range of

activities that student affairs divisions use to address specific multicultural issues.

In Chapter Three, details about the sampling design for the study are offered. Instrumentation construction, research design and procedures, and data collection and analysis also are discussed in this chapter.

Chapter Four examines the data analysis completed for this study. This analysis is discussed and compared to the hypotheses that were generated for this study. Four primary analysis were performed and explored using the variables of number of multiracial interventions, primary target of the interventions (individual, group, or institution), the type of intervention (1^{st}- or 2^{nd}-order), and the extent to which MCOD strategies were employed by the respondents.

In Chapter Five the final results of this study are discussed and explained as are possible limitations of the study and needs for future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Student affairs administrators at colleges and universities across the country are increasingly concerned about multicultural issues on their campuses. Some predict that these concerns will continue to be in the forefront of campus issues well into the next century (Manning and Coleman-Boatwright, 1991). One of the principal multicultural issues appears to be the quest to make predominantly White (eurocentric) college and university campus environments more welcoming and inviting to students of color. At many campuses, the goal is to create campuses which are not only more welcoming to students of color, but to also create environments which are truly multicultural. The latter goal dictates careful examination of campus policies and structures which, consciously or not, project the institutional values and commitment which in this country historically have been monocultural and monoracial (Katz, 1989; Manning and Coleman-Boatwright, 1991). From this process of self-examination, a campus community committed to becoming multicultural will invest resources and make necessary structural changes in order to create an environment which demonstrates an openness to and appreciation of all diverse cultures, people, and values.

This study will focus primarily and deliberately on race-related issues in an effort to develop a model useful for addressing other multicultural issues.

The purpose of this review of the literature is to develop a frame of reference about student affairs and multicultural interventions. The goal of this literature review is to explore the strategies currently utilized in student affairs to create multicultural campus environments. A second goal of this literature review is to examine the ways in which organization development has been utilized in student affairs and to introduce the concepts of multicultural organization development (MCOD) to college campus and more specifically, to student affairs divisions. The origins and current status of student affairs are examined in the first section. The goals of the section are to provide an overview and a context with which to better understand the multicultural interventions currently used in student affairs. This overview is followed by a review of selected underlying theoretical concepts crucial to an understanding of change efforts in student affairs. Systems theory and person-environment theory are be examined briefly as these are useful to set the stage for examining long-term change theory and the role of the environment on cultural interventions. The next section discusses organization development (OD) in student affairs. This section includes an examination of an OD definition and overview of the

origins of OD; the origins of OD in student affairs; a brief summary of the OD management technologies utilized in student affairs. This section is concluded with a review of some general OD concepts or principles used in student affairs.

An examination of organization development and the multicultural change efforts utilized in student affairs is offered next. This exploration is followed by a discussion of the key concepts and principles of Multicultural Organization Development (MCOD) and its implications for student affairs. A summary of the chapter and the literature is presented in the final section.

Origins and Current Status of Student Affairs

Much like its English residential college predecessors, higher education in the United States initially assigned primary responsibility for the maturation of the student's intellect and moral character to the president and members of the faculty (Barr, Keating, & Associates, 1985; Fenske, 1989). In the U.S., sometime near the end of the nineteenth century, the separate and unique roles of student affairs administrators emerged. Fenske (1989) attributes three fundamental changes in U.S. higher education in the late 1800s to the advent of student affairs: (a) a shift from a religious to a more secular orientation; (b) expansion of size and increased complexity of the institutions; and (c) faculty reorientation toward research and away from student

moral development. These changes, according to Fenske, precipitated the hiring of individuals charged with the responsibility for the "...necessary and sometimes unpopular tasks abandoned by trustees, administrators, and faculty" (Fenske, 1989, p. 6). In essence, the faculty and administrators no longer wanted to be involved in either the out-of-class experiences of students or their moral or personal development. Thus, the emergence, and subsequent evolution, of the field of student affairs was the result of default by the rest of the institution (Fenske, 1989).

Throughout the twentieth century, the student affairs profession has continued to grow and change as higher education has developed. The large increase in the numbers of students attending colleges and universities has been cited as being primarily responsible for the growth in the student affairs profession (Appleton, Briggs, & Rhatigan, 1978; Barr, Keating, & Associates, 1985; Fenske, 1989; Hood & Arceneaux, 1990; Owens, Whitten, & Bailey, 1982).

An era of rapid change that greatly altered the role and responsibilities of student affairs professionals on the nation's campuses occurred between the 1950's and the mid 1960's. Deegan (1981) identifies the profound impact of three major changes: (a) unparalleled growth in higher education enrollments, (b) increased politicization of higher education, and (c) the emergence of a youth culture demanding voice and participation in the decisions that

affected them. According to Deegan, "the cumulative result of these changes was to increase the complexity, decrease the autonomy, and expand the democracy involved in governing and managing institutions of higher education" (p. 6).

During the late 1960's and early 1970's, a major shift in philosophical orientation occurred in the student affairs profession. Prior to this period almost all colleges and universities adhered to a philosophy of *in loco parentis*. This philosophy viewed students as immature and expected colleges and universities to take responsibility for students and act in the place of the parents (Hood & Arceneaux, 1990; Rodgers, 1989). The goal of *in loco parentis* was to control student behavior following prescribed moral and theological values (Rodgers, 1989). Concurrent with the shift in philosophical orientation, student affairs professionals were relegated the tasks of responding to student unrest and restoring order on campuses and acting as the institutional liaison between the students and the rest of the university community (Deegan, 1981; Hood & Arceneaux, 1990).

In partial response to continuing student demands for a voice in the decisions that affected them as well as the demise of *in loco parentis*, a different philosophy and approach to meeting the needs of students emerged - student development. In using formal theories of both individual and group development, student development philosophy

attempts to create environments that help college and university students learn and grow (Rodgers, 1989). The use of formal theories in student development is critical because they provide the criteria, both general and specific, necessary to design the policies, procedures, programs, and environments that are developmentally appropriate (Rodgers, 1989). Unlike *in loco parentis*, the philosophical orientation of student development is defined by multiple theories which are then merged with student affairs practice, rather than by the selective moral and theological foundations of *in loco parentis* (Rodgers, 1989).

Another important aspect of student development is the recognition that the out-of-class experience of students is a valuable educational tool that must be used effectively and is crucial to the growth and development of students. Additionally, student development theories recognize that the task of assisting students grow and develop in all areas, not just intellectually, is the task of the entire college or university and not just the domain of student affairs (Crookston, 1976). Although this realization had been acknowledged previously (Blaesser, 1949; Brouwer, 1949; Hardee, 1955), it was not until the 1960s that full recognition of the need for secure and powerful links with the academic components of the campuses were identified as absolutely vital to the success of student development.

With higher education institutions showing increased interest in the entire student and in making substantial changes in academic environments, student affairs has a potentially powerful role to play in this holistic pursuit (Strange, 1991).

Whatever the philosophical orientation or guiding principles, two responsibilities have remained constant throughout the evolution of student affairs. Student affairs divisions provide vital institutional services and respond to the out-of-class experience of students. In general, "organization patterns within higher education place student affairs administrators in prominent roles to implement educational programs of the institution" (Creamer & Frederick, 1991, p. 135). Today, although the roles may have become increasingly complex and, in some cases, are highly bureaucratic, the responsibilities remain the same. Barr, Keating, and Associates (1985) assert that student affairs attempt to achieve one or more of these major goals:

1. Provide essential institutional services (i.e., student conduct services, health services, residence halls, financial aid, athletics, counseling services, etc.);

2. Teach life management skills (i.e., interpersonal skills, leadership skills, conflict resolution, group management, teamwork, etc); and

3. Integration of knowledge (i.e., residence hall floors with an academic focus, special seminars and lecture programs, etc.).

According to Strange (1991), "what is needed to guide these practices is a comprehensive model of the college environment that describes its various features and sub-environments and assists the campus community (faculty, students, and staff alike) in understanding how such factors can either encourage or inhibit student development" (p. 161). Strange also believes that student affairs professionals have the opportunity and responsibility to ultimately help students attain their academic potential and educational goals.

In addition to these concrete tasks, student affairs professionals have also taken responsibility for the development of community on campuses (a sense of connection, belonging, and responsibility) (Barr, Keating, and Associates, 1985). As the student population becomes more culturally diverse, creating a sense of community becomes increasingly complex. Underlying these complications are issues of racism, sexism, heterosexism and homophobia, anti-semitism, and other forms of oppression. The invisibility and marginality of members of oppressed groups has a pervasive and deteriorating effect on an individual's sense of belonging. Thus, even the most subtle forms of oppression undermines a sense of community and make the job

of the student affairs practitioner even more difficult (Ebbers, 1990).

Selected Review of Underlying Theoretical Concepts

Basic to the understanding of how to create multicultural campus environments and what systemic multicultural change efforts entail is the need to comprehend the underlying theoretical concepts that support and build a foundation for an environmental, organizational, and institutional perspective. Two major theoretical constructs central to this understanding are systems theory and person-environment theory.

There are numerous theories and clusters of theories that help to explain human organizations and institutions and why people behave the way they do in organizations. One such cluster of theories is systems theories. The first general theory of systems was created by von Berttalanffy (1949) and is applicable across all disciplines and all levels (e.g., the cell, the person, the group, and the society) (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Many theoretical notions and diverse theoretical perspectives have grown out of some of von Berttalanffy's basic concepts and constructs. Systems theories persuade one to view organizations as biotic systems, living in a broader environment with interrelated, interdependent, and interacting components (Bolman & Deal, 1984; Gray & Stark, 1988; Morgan, 1986). According to Morgan, system theorists have come to view

organizations as a "kind of biology in which the distinctiveness and relations among molecules, cells, complex organisms, species, and ecology are paralleled in those between individuals, groups, organizations, populations (species) of organizations, and their social ecology" (p. 40).

In essence, according to system theorists, all parts of the system are related and therefore any change in one component of the system has an effect on every other part of the system (Gray & Stark, 1988). According to Conyne (1991), "adoption of a system view to college life easily allows one to see that issues related to student welfare and development are involved closely with issues related to a host of other populations and conditions, both internal and external to the campus. Everything seems to be connected" (p. 95). Moreover, Miller and Prince (1977) citing Hoberstroh (1965) assert that the ability to move an organization in a desired direction requires that one first identify the parts of the system, discern their relationship, and explain the processes by which they are merged.

Systems theories also identify and emphasize the need for adaptive skills within organizations (Katz and Kahn, 1978). As one component of an organization changes, the rest of the system must have the ability to react to the change and adapt if the organization is to survive.

Fundamentally, a systems theory perspective necessitates that the entire system be assessed and diagnosed rather than solely relying on that which is obvious or most readily accessible (Gray & Stark, 1988). Systems theories and approaches have been explored in many ways within higher education. A systems approach to utilizing and understanding a student development perspective was created by The American Council on Education (ACE) (Creager, 1968). The four variables of this approach are: 1) students, 2) institutional environment, 3) interaction between students and their environment, and 4) the sum total of the students' feelings, behaviors, and thoughts (Hurst, 1987). This approach is most useful in the process of making institutional interventions and is similar to the ecosystems approach which grew out of person-environment theories (Hurst, 1987).

Person-environment theories are basic to much of the student development oriented applications and interventions within higher education since the initial work of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) in 1973 which offered the notion of a campus ecosystem that was made up of the campus environment, the institutional and organizational structure, and the perceptions of the members of the campus community (Shang & Moore, 1990). According to Cheatham (1991) and Strange (1991), student affairs professionals are in a unique position to use their

knowledge and skills about student development and how the interaction between students and the educational environment occurs thus maximizing their potential to have a positive and enhancing effect on students.

The ecosystems approach, which has been widely used in higher education within student development perspectives, focuses on the campus environment or ecology as a potential target of assessment, diagnosis, and intervention. Using a systems point of view, the environment, the students, and their interaction are seen as subsystems (Hurst, 1987). More specifically, a campus ecology approach is the application of an interactionist or person-environment perspective in higher education. The basis of the interactionistic point of view comes from the work of Lewin who created a widely known formula B = f (P x E) in which the behavior of the person (B) is seen as a function of the interaction between the person (P) and the environment (E) (Huebner, 1990). In general, the ecosystems approach is "proactive rather than reactive and is focused more on designing (or redesigning) campus environments to meet the needs of members rather than 'adjusting' or 'treating' students so that they fit into existing environments" (Huebner, 1990, p. 167). In addition, this strategy also is focused on assisting students in using their environment and resources more effectively, choosing environments that are

most conducive to growth, and when necessary, leaving environments that do not encourage growth.

An ecosystems approach views all three subsystems as potential targets of assessment and intervention. Ecosystems based interventions rarely follow any one theoretical perspective or model consistently (Huebner, 1979), rather "a practical application seems most often to be built on an eclectic rationale" (Hurst, 1987, p.7). Several ecosystem models have been used repeatedly in higher education (Aulepp & Delworth, 1978; Banning & Kaiser, 1974; Daher, Corazzini, & McKinnon, 1977). Although not adequately researched, according to Hurst (1987), ecosystems are more systematic, comprehensive, and intentional in their diagnosis and intervention of the student, the environment, and their interaction.

According to Banning and Hughes (1986), "the major implications of the ecological perspective is in giving guidance on how to respond to diversity" (p. 23). Although these authors focused primarily on the diversity of the commuter students' experience, their point of view is very relevant to multicultural issues. Within the context of addressing racial issues, the burden of adjusting historically has been placed on students of color in higher education (Shang & Moore, 1990). More recently, higher education institutions have focused on providing specialized services to students of color to help them in that process;

however, these efforts often involved minimal and peripheral accommodations on the part of institutions. As such, the burden of change rarely has been on the institution (Banning & Hughes, 1986; Shang & Moore, 1990). According to Hurst (1987), the "campus can and should be the target of intervention" (p. 9). Responding to cultural diversity on campus from an ecological perspective suggests interventions based in individual as well as organizational and institutional change. "The initial focus in the student development movement...displayed a fundamental weakness in the face of the recognition that sometimes the deficit is in the environment and not the student" (Hurst, 1987, p. 9). Cultural biases evident in campus environments have made it difficult to create inclusive and affirming environments. As higher education increasingly has become culturally diverse, there has been a need to create environments that are true to that diversity.

Within the ecosystem design strategy, as typified by the WICHE (1973) seven step process, "student involvement becomes more than a politically expedient tactic, but an ethical necessity" (Banning & Hughes, 1986, p. 23). According to Huebner and Banning (1987), "those who are affected by a program, by an evaluation, or by any intervention, should have the right to participate in the selection or design of the intervention" (p. 31). As such, ecosystem interventions must be student oriented.

Ultimately, the process of ecosystem design and intervention promotes "the right of all whose who are impacted by an ecology to have the opportunity to participate in its design" (Banning & Hughes, 1986, p. 23).

According to Huebner and Banning (1987), "the significant enhancement of the campus environment will not likely come without deliberate control" of the ecosystem design process (p. 29). What initially may have been an attempt at remediation of the campus environment became just one "step away from the concept of intentionally designing ecosystems to assure the process of student development" (Hurst, 1987, p. 9). The various theories about the campus environments "confirm the importance of positive interaction with one's environment as a significant variable in student growth" (Shang & Moore, 1990, p. 73). However, as the campus populations continue to change and expand, the need for new theories and models becomes increasingly apparent (Shang & Moore, 1990).

In summary, the theories and models available to increase one's understanding of environmental, organizational, and institutional perspectives derive from the literature surrounding systems theory and person-environment theory. Both clusters of theories are applicable across all disciplines and address the dynamic and complex nature of human behavior and how it adapts and changes. Without this theoretical point of view,

considering the value and emphasis in this culture on individuality, it is too easy to become overly focused on an individual (i.e., person vs. environment) perspective. An environmental and organizational theoretical framework is prerequisite to examining the process of multicultural change efforts. In addition, an understanding of theories of planned change and the processes of that change is important. Organization development (O.D.) provides that background information.

Organization Development in Student Affairs

Numerous definitions of O.D. are contained in the literature both within that specific literature and that applied to higher education (Bennis, Benne, & Chinn, 1985; Borland 1980; Conyne, 1991; Cummings & Huse, 1989; French & Bell, 1973; Huse, 1978; Kurpius, 1980; Miller & Prince, 1976; Owens, 1987; Schmuck & Miles, 1971). The dynamic nature of OD, as presented in the literature, in fact, precludes a single or unified definition with which all authors agree. OD and its intervention strategies are regarded as evolving (Bartunek & Moch, 1987). However, enough agreement does exist to suggest that OD is a process for beneficial systemic change as opposed to random or coincidental change (Conyne, 1991; Hammons, 1982; Varney, 1982).

Existing definitions of OD overlap significantly; the definition as offered by Cummings & Huse will be utilized for this paper. Organization development is "a systemwide

application of behavioral science knowledge to the planned development and reinforcement of organizational strategies, structures, and processes for improving an organization's effectiveness" (1989, p. 1). This definition appears to incorporate a philosophical statement and the means for achieving it. A definition that is both a goal and a method for accomplishing it is not a foreign concept to student affairs practitioners as the oft quoted much used definition of student development offered by Miller and Prince (1976) provides one example "...the application of human development concepts in a postsecondary setting so that everyone involved can master increasingly complex tasks, achieve self-direction, and become interdependent" (p.3). According to Conyne (1991), OD is a process that can be used to "avoid stagnation, and perhaps death, and to promote organizational health" (p. 96). Fundamentally, OD is concerned with planned systemic change (Cummings & Huse, 1989; French & Bell, 1984; Owens, 1987; Schmuck & Miles, 1971). OD is not an inflexible blueprint of what should be done, how, and when, unlike plans often associated with formal business planning (c.f., Cummings & Huse 1989; French & Bell, 1984; Owens, 1987; Schmuck & Miles, 1971). Rather, OD is more of a flexible and adaptive strategy for planning and activating change. It involves planning to diagnose and solve organizational concerns, yet it remains flexible so that plans can be altered as new information is available

after the implementation of the change strategy (Cummings & Huse, 1989; Owens, 1987). Accordingly, OD is concerned both with the formation and the subsequent reinforcement of organizational change (Cummings & Huse, 1989; Owens, 1987; Schmuck & Miles, 1971). It goes beyond merely activating a change program to a "longer term concern for stabilizing and institutionalizing change within the organization" (Cummings & Huse, 1989, p. 2).

OD practitioners utilize a systemic approach to change because they view organizations as a series of interrelated subsystems which need to be internally congruent and aligned (Katz & Kahn, 1978; Lake & Callahan, 1971; Morgan, 1986; Tichy, 1983). The subsystems consist of strategic (goals and values), technological, human/cultural (psychosocial), structural, and managerial components (Lake & Callahan, 1971; Morgan; Tichy, 1983). An OD change strategy then would focus interventions or "action on a number of fronts - in relation to strategy, technology, organization structure, and its management style" (Morgan, 1986, p. 65). It further would focus attention and action to the core goals, values, and mission of the organization.

Organization development is a comparatively recent concept. Although, as Woodman and Muse (1982) suggest, the underlying ideas, strategies, and assumptions existed long before the field of OD emerged. Woodman and Muse attribute to Tannenbaum & Davis the recognition that trends in the

way in which society categorizes and administers its endeavors are very congruent with basic OD principles and values. Woodman and Muse contend that "OD has both contributed to and benefitted from these trends; in some sense, it may be a natural outgrowth of them" (p. 24). In addition, as a distinct domain, OD has weathered continued growth and development since its emergence. It has expanded from its narrow beginnings of sensitivity training and T-groups to a comprehensive discipline which gives increasing attention to organization strategy, technology, and design (Cummings & Huse, 1989; Woodman & Muse, 1982).

Much like student affairs whose origins can be traced initially from the academic disciplines of psychology and counseling (Borland, 1980), OD emerged from the behavioral sciences, gaining most of its grounding from the disciplines of psychology and sociology (Cummings & Huse, 1989; Varney, 1982; Woodman & Muse, 1982). Laboratory training or education is often acknowledged as one of the primary stems of OD in its historical development (Burke, 1987; Cummings and Huse, 1989; French and Bell, 1978; Hammons, 1982; Huse, 1980; Schmuck & Miles, 1971; Woodman & Muse, 1982). Other primary stems include survey research and feedback, action research, as well as productivity and the quality of work life (Cummings & Huse, 1989).

Origins of OD in Student Affairs

Although OD is a rather new concept in general, in higher education OD is even more recent. An increase in OD in higher education literature has occurred within the past fifteen years (Baldridge & Deal, 1971; Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980; Boyer & Crockett, 1973; Conyne, 1991; Glaser, Abelson, & Garison, 1983; Hammons, 1982; Hipps, 1982; Martorana & Kuhns, 1975), however, it is still not common (Creamer and Creamer, 1986). While the literature may have increased, generally the implementation of OD principles and technologies in higher education has been stonewalled. Much of this opposition is due to OD's industrial origin (Borland, 1980). Borland identifies a tradition in colleges and universities to disavow any significant characteristics found in colleges and universities that may be in common with business, industrial, military, or penal organizations. Regardless of the results of empirical studies to the contrary or the increasing similarities between Weber's classic description of bureaucratic organizations and a growing number of colleges and universities, higher education institutions on the whole continue to deny any likeness.

An additional multifarious factor to weigh when examining the implementation of OD in higher education is the basic nature of colleges or universities. Blaesser (1978) reports that in higher education, in some ways, it is

near impossible and a hopelessly mired task to implement change strategies: "someone once said that it is easier to move a cemetery than to achieve a change of any significance in a college or university" (p. 111). Much of this complexity is because of the structure of higher education which is, in many ways, unique or at least quite different from that of industry (Bennis 1973; Boleman & Deal, 1984; Coyne, 1991). Higher education institutions, unlike industry, typically have multiple and diffuse goals, an abundance of subsystems, indistinct boundaries, greater difficulty in measuring the caliber of its product, minimal task interdependence and informal mechanisms for coordination, and weak technologies (Blaesser, 1978; Boleman & Deal, 1984; Boyer & Crockett, 1973). However, despite this general resistance to OD in higher education and the unique complications involved in higher education governance, OD is currently being used and has been used successfully in various forms at individual institutions (Borland, 1980; Conyne, 1991; Hammons, 1982).

The unique characteristics that have proven somewhat problematic for implementing OD in higher education in general, have less impact in student affairs. In many ways, student affairs offers a different receptivity, climate, and environment to OD and other management tools borrowed from the world of business than are offered by other aspects of higher education (Conyne, 1991; Creamer & Frederick, 1991;

Owens, Meabon, Suddick, & Klein, 1981). In comparison to other subdivisions in higher education (e.g., academic affairs), student affairs divisions have reasonably well-defined long-term goals, clearer boundaries, a more unified chain of command, and more extensive control systems.

Further, as demands for accountability increased and competition for limited resources escalated, student affairs practitioners were obliged to search for innovative methods to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their divisions as well as to insure that their organizations operated in a more unbiased and humane fashion (Conyne, 1991; Foxley, 1980). According to Foxley, "the educational environment which has these characteristics is considered to have 'organizational health' and is far more likely to facilitate and enhance student development and learning than the 'unhealthy organization' which is viewed by its members as being unaccountable, inefficient, ineffective, biased, and inhumane" (p. vii).

Originally the student affairs functions on college campuses were quite small and relatively simple to administer. However, as student affairs divisions increased in size and complexity, more administrative and organizational challenges evolved. In their efforts to improve the health and effectiveness of student affairs divisions, many practitioners adopted various tools and technologies from business and industrial settings (Aiken,

Duncan, & McClintock, 1975; Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1977; Borland, 1980; Creamer & Frederick, 1991; Deegan, 1981; Deegan & Fritz, 1975; Harpel, 1976; Hurst, Weigel, Morrill, & Richardson, 1973; Kurpius, 1978; 1980). According to Ambler (1989), most of these technologies arrived on campuses in the late 1960s and early 1970s when "enrollments and resources peaked and began to decline" (p. 252).

Although general organization development literature is abundant and there is an appearance of greater receptivity to OD principles, studies of OD in student affairs remain rather limited (Creamer & Creamer, 1986). In reviewing the student affairs OD and management technology literature, two general categories are apparent.

A continually expanding area within student affairs is the use of OD tools and techniques, such as management information systems (MIS) and management by objectives (MBO), in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of student affairs divisions. While these techniques are not customarily (although they are occasionally) found under the general heading of OD, for the purposes of this paper they will be identified as OD management techniques. The reason for this heading is because these technologies do fall under the general rubric of organizational change strategies.

The second category involves the application of general OD concepts or principles of planned change to student

affairs organizations, such as the emphasis on system approaches, which allows student affairs divisions to affect large-scale and longterm change. These categories will be examined separately.

OD Management Technologies

Under the general rubric of OD management techniques there are continually expanding tools. Within student affairs the most frequently utilized techniques are Management By Objectives (MBO), Management Information Systems (MIS), Long-Range Planning, and a variety of accountability measures.

Management by Objectives

According to Berman (1980), one of the most popular management tools used in higher education is Management by Objectives (MBO). The purpose of this concept was to ensure that all divisions of a large business were moving in a common direction (Berman, 1980; Deegan & Fritz, 1975). Like other segments of higher education, growing numbers of student affairs divisions have turned to MBO as the management tool of choice (Berman, 1980; Saurman & Nash, 1975). Conversely, other scholars (Barr & Keating, 1985) have indicated that student affairs professionals have not adapted and or utilized MBO in their work.

MBO has been utilized in student affairs to help define, set, and achieve goals and objectives (Barr & Keating, 1985; Berman, 1980; Di Tullio & Work, 1978).

According to Berman, MBO can have a beneficial effect on important features of student affairs functions. Saurman and Nash (1975) also express apprehensions with the implementation of an MBO program in student affairs. However, their concerns derive from more of a philosophical base. Saurman and Nash contend that MBO is inconsistent with the developmental orientation of student affairs. They recommend minimal reliance on technological strategies and stronger commitment to student development strategies and models.

Management Information Systems

At its most basic level a Management Information System (MIS) is a procedure that dispenses information in order to make managerial decisions and to perform management functions. According to Racippo and Foxley (1980), MIS operates on two levels. The first level functions are routine procedures (e.g. student registration, billing procedures, etc.). Higher level functions of MIS include tasks which augment the management operation (e.g. providing budget projections, enrollment projections, unit costs, etc.) (Racippo & Foxley, 1980).

Currently in student affairs, MIS, as a way to obtain and use data, it is not necessarily a new concept (Barr & Keating, 1985; MacLean, 1986). Barr and Keating contend that the use of MIS and new computer capabilities have simply provided a larger amount and type of data to student

affairs practitioners. An effective MIS offers some of the information required for effective goal setting and program evaluation. Barr and Keating offer a reminder that MIS are not designed to choose goals but simply to provide appropriate data for making those decisions. Program evaluation data provides information to identify which programs or services may be having difficulty (MacLean, 1986).

The National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) (1981) identifies two types of higher education MIS: 1) operational systems or 2) strategic planning systems. Operation systems typically "collect and store data, provide timely reports, and perform tasks" (MacLean, 1986, p. 3). Strategic planning systems are not as common and may be used for "long-range planning (i.e. five to 10 years), for establishing institutional goals, for identifying resources needs, and for developing policy" MacLean, 1986, p. 4).

Caution is recommended when implementing MIS into student affairs divisions. Barr and Keating (1985) and Kalsbeek (1989) advise that student affairs practitioners confront two obligations when activating MIS: (1) they must be integrally involved in the design, development, and maintenance of a MIS system whether it be a student affairs system or campus-wide system, and (2) they must stay cognizant of the very real effects on the quality of student

life that management decisions based on MIS may have. According to MacLean (1986), using and improving student affairs MIS, will allow administrators to "make better decisions on allocating resources as well as assisting students in their development" (p. 7).

Long-Range Planning

According to Deegan (1981), planning is one of the most basic and widespread management functions. Nevertheless, it is also one of the most debated and, at times, the least utilized because of the perception of additional paperwork, pressure, and time-wasting committees (Pillinger & Kraack, 1981; Deegan, 1981; Gurowitz, Trochim, & Kramer, 1988; Morrison, Renfro, & Boucher, 1984; Priest, Alphenaar, & Boer, 1980). Long-range planning refers to planning for a time span from one to five years (Pillinger & Kraack, 1981; Deegan, 1981). Several general long-range planning models are offered in the literature (Deegan, 1981; Pillinger and Kraack, 1981; Priest, Alphenaar, and Boer, 1980; Uhl, 1983). Each model is quite broad and universal requiring student affairs divisions to tailor the model to meet their institutional needs. According to Gurowitz, Trochim, and Kramer (1988), the long-range planning process involves three activities (diagnosis, formulation, and execution) which operate within two frames, strategic and organizational, to create a two by three matrix which allows one to understand and evaluate the process. An organization

frame focuses on what the organization can do while the strategic frame concentrates on what the organizations should do.

Strategic Planning

Although some authors (Gurowits, Trochim, & Kramer, 1988; Uhl, 1983) appear to use the terms long-range planning and strategic planning interchangeably, others do not and make strong cases for why the two seemingly similar planning processes are in fact quite different (Keller, 1983; Morrison, Renfro, & Boucher, 1984). According to Morrison, Renfro and Boucher, "it is becoming more evident that traditional methods of long-range planning, with their inward focus on budgets and staff, are inadequate for our educational institutions....contemporary strategic planning differs...in that it adds a special emphasis on discerning and understanding potential changes in the external environment" (p. i). The strategic planning process focuses externally and maximizes the new and unique opportunities in the future. According to McLean (1991), "applied strategic planning deals with the inevitability of change within an organization ... and enables an organization to shape its own future rather than merely prepare for the future" (p. 6). It offers student affairs divisions adaptability by managing major internal and external variables over a specified period of time. Core to the philosophy of strategic planning is the belief that organizations are

strongly influenced by external forces and therefore being aware of future trends is one of its most central tenets.

Several specific models for strategic planning do exist and are gaining attention in the student affairs literature. Uhl (1983) offers a specific four-phase strategic planning process which involves: 1) evaluating internal and external environments, 2) creating long-range goals, 3) developing objectives and concrete action plans, and 4) identifying resource needs and financing. Continual feedback and updating during the process allows it to stay current and effective. It is appropriate to conclude as has McLean (1986) that "strategic planning is an ongoing dynamic process, one that enables the users to make changes in goals and resource allocations as internal and external environments change" (p. 4). Morrison et al (1984) offers a six stage process to carry out that future focus: 1) environmental scanning, 2) evaluation of issues, 3) forecasting, 4) goal setting, 5) implementation, and 6) monitoring.

Accountability Measures

By the mid-1970s "accountability" had already become a very familiar concept in student affairs (Barnes, Morton, & Austin, 1983; Kuh, 1979; Harpel, 1975; Lewis, 1973; Trembley & Sharf, 1975). Patrick and Niles (1988), identify "increased demand for accountability and evolution of services from a variety of constituency groups" (p. 291).

According to Trembley and Sharf, accountability is a method for conducting evaluation and generating data to answer questions central to deciding budgetary priorities. Others construe accountability as a "struggle for educational definition in terms of goals, objectives, program design, performance, and outcomes" (Barnes, Morton, & Austin, 1983, p. 10). Moreover, Barnes, Morton, and Austin conceptualize the accountability process as an important value-laden political subsystem of an organization with direct ramifications for resource allocation.

This process often is seen as a part of the struggle for scarce resources and may be seen as threatening (Patrick and Niles, 1988). In addition, student affairs administrators often have limited control over their budgets and the allocation process. A final roadblock to using accountability measures within student affairs is the perception that student development oriented efforts and interventions are not measurable (Patrick and Niles, 1988).

Although the term accountability is quite familiar in student affairs, Harpel (1975) reports that its application was not widespread. This lack of use was primarily due to the fact that student affairs practitioners, while familiar with the term and its goals, were not familiar with and had not been trained to utilize accountability tools or techniques. According to Harpel, although 90% of the respondents in his study collected varying amounts of cost

information about their student affairs units, these efforts were occurring without the assistance of trained staff, literature, or expert consultants. Several accountability models are suggested in the literature (Barnes, Morton, & Austin, 1983; Harpel, 1975; 1976; Trembley & Sharf). These models appear to be adaptable to either student affairs divisions or individual student affairs units.

In order for effective evaluation to occur within the accountability process, staff commitment must be solidified and roadblocks minimized (Patrick and Niles, 1988). In addition, the central and most powerful figures within the organizational structures must be involved. There must be full participation at all levels of the process in order to ensure effective communication and involvement in the process and related outcomes. Goals and objectives that are concrete and measurable must be developed and then data will be collected via a means deemed most appropriate by those involved. According to Patrick and Niles (1988), "after an acceptable evaluation plan has been devised, its validity depends on the manner in which it is carried out" (p. 295). Despite the potential roadblocks to effective evaluation and measures of accountability, without that process an organization or division opens itself up to criticism or potential loss of valuable resources (Patrick & Niles, 1988).

Discussion of OD Technologies Utilized in Student Affairs

Beginning in the late 1960s and throughout most of the 1980s, much of the student affairs literature discussed implementing and adapting management techniques into student affairs practice. The primary techniques examined were MBO, MIS, long-range planning, strategic planning, and a variety of general accountability strategies or models. While little research has examined the prevalence of such techniques in student affairs, Owens, et al. (1981) note that student affairs divisions reported implementing more management techniques than did their counterparts in either academic or business affairs.

Although there has been reported use and increased interest in these tools, some earlier data (throughout the 1970's and early 1980's) suggest that student affairs professionals received inadequate training or guidance in management and/or in the use of these specific techniques (Foxley, 1980; Harpel, 1975; McDaniel, 1972). More recently, Hood and Arceneaux (1990) identify a similar concern when they note that although a large number of professionals in student affairs work are full-time administrators, there are not many publications dealing specifically with student affairs administration. Moreover, Hood and Arceneaux further assert that knowledge of and the ability to apply administrative principles and practices become increasingly important as one progresses up the

student affairs career ladder. Hood and Arceneaux cite an often voiced concern of the student affairs field that suggests that "...those graduating from preparation programs have gained the skills for entry-level positions but lack the knowledge and administrative skills for the middle- and upper-level administrative positions to which they aspire" (p. 66).

This failure to provide training in either general administration and management processes or in the use of specific management technologies to current student affairs workers or students in the preparation programs can lead to lack of understanding, inappropriate implementation, and inadequate results. The lack of education and training may also adversely affect staff morale through increased frustration and may be perceived as solely an increase in work load, particularly paperwork, without forthcoming results. Increased knowledge and training about various management theories or techniques is not a panacea and will not solve the problems facing student affairs (Foxley, 1980). However, improper and incorrect use of these techniques and processes can only exacerbate existing problems.

Student affairs literature supports the appropriate application of these management techniques in the administration of student affairs divisions, particularly as efficiency and accountability issues continue to plague

higher education in the United States. However, the literature also advises caution in their application. A fundamental difficulty with OD, in either higher education or business, is the tendency to utilize one tool or strategy as a cure-all for every organizational problem (Cummings and Huse, 1989; Huse, 1978). Despite such concerns, authors of much of the literature reviewed for this section of the paper have advocated for the implementation of a particular tool or technique. This advocacy for the adoption of particular OD tools and techniques in the student affairs literature limits the ability of the profession to benefit from the diverse strengths of OD. Instead student affairs professionals need to become trained and proficient in the use of a variety of OD processes such as data gathering, diagnosis, and evaluation. Integrating the use of OD tools and technologies within a process oriented framework will allow the student affairs profession to more fully benefit from the study and use of OD.

General OD Concepts or Principles in Student Affairs

Since at least the early 1970s, endorsements for the introduction of general OD principles and concepts into the work of student affairs have been proposed (Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980; Caple, 1987; Conyne, 1991; Creamer & Creamer, 1986a; 1986b; 1988; 1989; Crookston & Blaesser, 1962; Kurpius, 1980; Lipsetz, 1973; Miller & Prince, 1976). Several authors advocate the use of OD principles and

concepts for the general goal of improving the effectiveness, performance, and quality of life of student affairs divisions (Foxley, 1980; Kurpius, 1980; Lipsetz, 1973). However, most of the writers advocate the use of OD as a means for systemically incorporating student development theory and models into the work of student affairs (Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980; Caple, 1987; Creamer & Creamer, 1986).

Blaesser (1978), a leading proponent of utilizing OD as a means for fully integrating student development theory and praxis into the student affairs profession, suggests that "student development programs will make minimal progress in higher education without the intentional application of sound approaches to organizational change" (p. 109). Blaesser recommends that student affairs practitioners and student development theorists study and consider the implementation of OD and its concepts and strategies as an effective method of organizational change. He believes that in order to successfully integrate student development theory and philosophy into student affairs, organized and coordinated change efforts are essential.

Borland (1980) describes OD as a professional imperative for successful implementation of student development theory in student affairs. Like Blaesser (1978), Borland believes that the concepts of organization development and student development should become integrated

in student affairs as they often have more common elements than are recognized on the surface. Borland (1980) recognizes the need for systems approaches. He offers a specific organization development strategy in order to implement student development theories and programs. His approach emphasizes using specific strategies in order to create a campus environment that is responsive and sensitive to the developmental needs of students. Extending student development theory into student affairs praxis through the use of OD concepts and practices will help create both individual and institutional growth and development.

Creamer and Creamer (1986a; 1986b; 1988; 1989), also interested in using OD principles to integrate student development into student affairs, report several studies designed to increase the understanding of planned change in higher education. Utilizing Davis and Salasin's AVICTORY model, a framework of planned change, as an initial guide, the Probability of Adoption of Change (PAC) model was developed.

At its most basic level the PAC model suggests that the likelihood of an organization adopting a planned change project can be predicted by utilizing knowledge of seven specific conditions (circumstances, value compatibility, idea comprehensibility, practicality, superintendency, advantage probability, and strategies) (Creamer & Frederick, 1991). These studies examined the role of leaders,

curriculum-reform projects, and program innovation in planned change efforts in student affairs. Findings from these studies offer support for the importance of each PAC variable in anticipating outcomes of planned change efforts in student affairs. The PAC model also has been found to be accurate in predicting change across different institutional settings (Creamer & Creamer, 1989). The PAC model was developed after extensive study of OD principles and concepts utilized in higher education. Creamer and Creamer (1986a) report that previously the OD literature in higher education was based on research and reports of practitioners utilizing models which were, for the most part, "unsupported by theories of organizational change" (p. 19). The PAC model explores selected issues in organization development, specifically the implementation of student development theories to student affairs. The PAC model, and subsequent PAC model studies, offer empirical data with which to view planned change efforts in student affairs.

Creamer and Creamer (1986a; 1986b; 1988; 1989) in their exploration of OD in student affairs focused on the development and validation of a specific model, other authors however, have chosen to focus more generally on OD change strategies. Blaesser (1978) offers a taxonomy of three change strategies which was initially formulated by Chin and Benne (1969). Kurpius (1980) asserts the need for student affairs practitioners to be fully cognizant of the

contextual issues and properties of systems prior to applying OD principles in student affairs. Borland (1980) offers a general five component OD strategy in efforts to implement student development in student affairs. Conyne (1991) provides first a basic review of OD theories and strategies and then suggests several possible uses of OD for student affairs administrators. One such model called CORE (cohesion, organization, resourcefulness, and energy) was created by Conyne to offer a framework for organization assessment and intervention.

In an article directed to student affairs practitioners, Kurpius (1980) discusses the issues involved in applying OD in higher education. He identifies three decision making processes common to higher education in the United States - the collegial model, the bureaucratic model, and the political model. He suggests that these models all have attributes which support and oppose OD practices.

These models, proposed by Kurpius (1980) and others (Baldridge, 1971; Birnbaum, 1988; Boyer & Crockett, 1973; Clark, 1983; Wise, 1968) comprise a vast majority of both the OD in higher education literature and the higher education organization theory literature; however, the degree to which student affairs is directly affected by these models is unclear. Governance issues unique to higher education have less of an impact in student affairs than in other aspects of higher education, particularly as related

to these models. Although some authors disagree, in student affairs more traditional administrative models and decision making processes are utilized. Undoubtedly, student affairs divisions are affected by the models and decision making processes utilized elsewhere in the university, therefore it is essential to have this knowledge (Kurpius, 1980).

Successful OD interventions have been instituted in individual student affairs divisions. However, they have not yet been successful or attempted in other divisions. Borland (1980) and others (e.g., Blaesser, 1978; Huse, 1978; Kurpius, 1980, Varney, 1982) identify several problems or barriers to implementing OD in higher education and more specifically, student affairs.

Resistance to change is often an initial barrier to OD interventions (Borland, 1980). Within higher education organizations, and most organizations in general, there is a bias toward accepting the status quo (Blaesser, 1978; Borland, 1980; Kurpius, 1980). Often change, regardless of the potential benefit, is viewed as an assault on the status quo.

Another barrier to a successful OD intervention is improper analysis (Borland, 1980). Improper analysis often occurs because of the lack of planning and the desire to obtain a "quick-fix" to a presenting problem. Related to the problem of improper analysis, is an incorrect (often

underestimation) of expenses of time and professional allegiance in the design of the OD plan (Borland, 1980).

An additional barrier to successful OD interventions in student affairs is the failure to view organizations as systems with complex and interrelated subsystems (Huse, 1978). This view often minimizes the interdependent nature of the subsystems and may result in organizational isolation and prevent organizational growth (Borland, 1980; Huse, 1978). Another barrier to successful OD interventions in student affairs not listed in this literature include financial and human resources. Typically OD intervention can be expensive particularly if external OD consultants are utilized. Most student affairs divisions do not employ internal OD consultants making external consultants mandatory and, therefore, costly.

A final barrier to successful OD interventions in student affairs, suggested by Borland (1980), is ineffective evaluation. Failure to evaluate student affairs programs or innovations is not a new issue or problem. Kuh (1979) believes that student affairs is consistently remiss in terms of evaluation. Clearly the failure to evaluate most student affairs efforts has ramifications for effective organizational change. Without evaluation it is not possible to know whether one's efforts have been successful (Harris, 1991).

Discussion of General OD Principles and Concepts in Student Affairs

In reviewing the literature on general OD principles in student affairs, several conclusions can be drawn. The use of OD concepts and strategies in student affairs has been proposed since at least the early 1970s. These approaches are encouraged as a means of integrating student development theory into student affairs. As well, several authors have suggested utilizing OD as a method of developing more effective and efficient student affairs divisions. The recommended modalities range from the use of specific models (e.g., PAC model) to a more general utilization of a systemic and cyclical planned change process.

Some of the literature appears to be based on assumptions about student affairs that may be inaccurate or one-dimensional. The unique structures of higher education, in general, are often not germane to the administrative structures of student affairs and yet the literature implies that they are similar or the same. However, although they are not the same, it is important for student affairs practitioners to be cognizant of the governance structures of academic affairs, in particular, in order to be most effective in working with the total institution. The tendency to segment and separate student affairs from the rest of the institution minimizes the interdependence that exists in a large and multifaceted organization. Student

affairs, as an institutional division, does not occur in a vacuum and any OD strategies utilized within the division must take this fact into account.

With the exception of the PAC model, there are few studies to validate the claim for specific OD strategies or concepts. The PAC model has been researched repeatedly and examined in a variety of contexts which adds to its strength as a viable model for planned change in student affairs. However, other authors who support more general strategies offer little empirical evidence to validate their suggested approaches.

Much of the literature recommends the use of OD strategies in an effort to infuse student development theories and practices into student affairs praxis. The literature recognizes the need for systemic planned change efforts, with top-level support, in order to truly integrate student development. However, the suggested strategies for such linkage are under-researched and are still lacking concrete recommendations for implementation. In addition, according to Creamer and Frederick (1991), there is some question about models of planned change which are not well supported by any theory.

OD and Multicultural Change Efforts in Student Affairs

Despite these barriers, OD is still a necessary and viable tool for student affairs. OD provides the planned change strategies necessary to institute long-term systemic

change. It adequately addresses the fundamental structures and processes of student affairs divisions. However, when addressing multicultural or social justice issues, OD alone is not enough.

The founders of OD had initially hoped that traditional OD change efforts would have an impact on social justice issues in organizations (Jackson & Holvino, 1988). Driscoll (1990) states, "OD is cloaked in the mystique of being the champion of social reform in organizations," (p. 62) yet OD really perpetuates the status quo - not a transformational effort.

Although OD is designed, in part, to challenge and change existing sub-optimal systems and structures, it is limited by its current practices and theories. OD is based in a monocultural perspective in which organizational values, goals, norms, and practices are based in only one culture, the dominant culture. In the United States and on predominantly white college campuses, the dominant culture is that which is white, male, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied, and monied. The ultimate barrier to OD's attempts to transform organizational reality and culture lies, then, in its ultimate acceptance of organizational culture in its current form (Driscoll, 1990). OD fails even to recognize that there may be other viable realities and cultures.

Campuses across the nation have begun to recognize the limited range of human diversity on most campuses and have

made increasing efforts to expand the diversity of those who participate in higher education, primarily focusing on racial/ethnic differences. In student affairs these efforts essentially include consciousness-raising or racial/ethnic awareness programs aimed at decreasing bias and violence targeted at students of color. For the most part, these workshops or programs are designed for students and are not for student affairs staff and administrators. On many campuses, in addition to racial/ethnic awareness programs, an individual is hired to be primarily responsible for addressing the needs of students of color which may include recruitment and retention efforts. Although these programs are necessary and serve an important educational function, they are not enough. These programs fail to reflect the important points, and necessary precursors to change, as identified by the systems and organization development literature.

A sporadic and uncoordinated series of programs by dedicated and sincere individuals will not suffice. While the efforts may increase the numbers of students of color, they do not necessarily impact the level of racism on campus in any measurable fashion. These efforts do not alter the fundamental structure of the student affairs divisions or campus culture. As such, these efforts do not create multicultural campus environments. At best these efforts only increase the numbers of a given social group membership

on a particular campus, but do little to acknowledge the contributions (both historical and current), values, and interests of these groups. "In order to assure that all students have the highest quality educational experiences possible, student affairs professional must make the commitment to reshape the educational environments as new challenges are encountered" (Jacoby, 1991, p. 304).

Over the past years, various attempts to create more culturally diverse campuses have been proposed (Austin, 1984; Ebbs & Henry, 1990; Edwards, 1983; Harvey, 1981; Hawkins, 1989; Jacoby, 1991; Manning & Coleman-Boatwright, 1991; O'Brien, 1990; Oppelt, 1989; Ponterotto, Lewis, & Bullington, 1990; Sedlacek, 1987; Strong, 1988; Wright, 1987). Practitioners in student affairs have made use of some of these publications as well as many others. The publications have value for practitioners interested in creating more welcoming environments for students of color. However, what is missing from these works is a systemic change process and framework which would buttress creative conceptualizing and experimenting with student affairs structures, processes, policies, and procedures. As well, more attention should be focused on the role of top-level administrators. Any significant long-range, long-term impact will be dependent on top-level administrative understanding and support.

Currently many campuses are focusing on issues of cultural diversity rather than on creating truly multicultural campus environments. Multicultural environments recognize and reflect the values, "contribution and interests of diverse cultural and social groups in its mission, operations, and ...service delivery" (Jackson & Hardiman, 1981, p.1). Conversely, cultural diversity often focuses primarily on increasing the numbers of a given social group membership. An important part of creating multicultural campuses is the ability to recognize and understand the underlying cultural values of an institution. While OD is able to articulate organizational culture, it rarely critiques and challenges those underlying values. However, central to the definition of multicultural organization development (MCOD) is the exploration and challenging of the monocultural values of organizations.

Multicultural Organization Development: Key Concepts and Principles

MCOD and all of its related terms and technologies remain in the stage of knowledge production (B.W. Jackson, personal communication, March 28, 1990). A large body of literature that describes, discusses, and debates its nature, function, and practices does not exist. In its current stage MCOD has been defined as an "organizational transformation effort which has as its primary objective the creation of socially diverse and socially just

organizations" (Driscoll, 1990, p. 129). By creating an organization that is sensitive to and embracing of diverse cultures, MCOD assumes that type of culture will be also more productive. An underlying goal of MCOD, therefore, is the creation of efficient, effective, productive, and socially diverse and socially just work environments. Where MCOD differs from OD is in the fundamental belief that an organization cannot be effective and healthy without addressing issues of social justice (B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990).

Although there is currently some debate as to whether MCOD is a separate and distinct field of planned change or if it is a subfield of OD (B.W. Jackson, personal communication, March 28, 1990; Driscoll, 1990), exploration of those distinctions is not within the scope of this paper. The purpose of this paper is to explore how best to incorporate multicultural values and practices into the work of student affairs utilizing MCOD as a model.

Much like OD, MCOD is a systemic planned change effort. It utilizes behavioral science knowledge and technologies for improving organizational effectiveness. MCOD moves beyond OD in that it challenges the status quo and questions the underlying cultural assumptions and structures of organizations. Inherent in this adaption of behavioral science knowledge and techniques is the commitment to

address the underlying racial, gender, etc., issues within an organization.

Also like OD, MCOD focuses its attention on the interrelated subsystems of an organization. MCOD change strategies necessitate action on the subsystems of an organization: mission and values, structure, technology, management practices, and the psycho-social dynamics (Lake & Callahan, 1971; B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990; Morgan, 1986). However, with MCOD the purpose of the attention on the subsystems is to help identify and remove or reduce the harmful effect of the monocultural nature of an organization which, in turn, can influence the effectiveness of an organization and the work environment (Jackson & Holvino, 1988).

Although OD and MCOD theorists and practitioners utilize similar strategies and technologies and they operate from similar epistemological and ontological assumptions about the nature of organizations and planned change, fundamental differences do exist. A primary difference involves the degree to which multicultural values and concepts influence and dictate the focus of the change effort. This difference is not only a contrast in the focus of an intervention itself, but it also demonstrates a philosophical dissension in the level of significance race and ethnicity, gender, and other social group memberships have on group interactions and group functioning.

The concept of MCOD as a method of planned change was developed in the early 1980s by the work of Bailey Jackson, Rita Hardiman, and Evangelina Holvino (B. W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990; Driscoll, 1990). Jackson, Hardiman, and Holvino are all OD theorists and practitioners who recognized the significant impact that race/ethnicity, gender, and other social group memberships have on organizational effectiveness and planned change efforts. Moreover, Jackson, Hardiman, and Holvino recognized the inherent limitations in OD interventions, particularly as they relate to concepts of social diversity and social justice (R. Hardiman, personal communication, Spring, 1990; B.W. B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990; personal communication, February, 1991). While a definitive definition of MCOD has not yet been adopted, Jackson and Hardiman (1981) have offered a description of a vision of a multicultural organization:

> A multicultural organization reflects the contribution and interests of diverse cultural and social groups in its mission, operations, and product or service delivery; acts on a commitment to eradicate social oppression in all forms within the organization; includes the members of diverse cultural and social groups as full participants, especially in decisions that shape the organization; and follows through on broader external social responsibilities, including support of efforts to eliminate all forms of social oppression and to educate others in multicultural perspectives (p. 1).

In an effort to reach this multicultural vision, Jackson and Hardiman (1983) and Katz and Miller (1986) have offered diagnostic instruments or models which assist in the assessment of an organization's stages of multicultural awareness or evolution. The instruments are similar (primarily because the Katz and Miller model was adapted from the Jackson and Hardiman model) and both offer a continuum which is chronological but not necessarily contiguous. According to Katz (1989), "the model outlines how organizations can move developmentally from being a monocultural system, whose goal is to maintain a White cultural system, to being an inclusionary, multicultural system, which seeks and values diversity" (p. 9).

An MCOD intervention highlights three particular areas for intervention: (1) the system; (2) the leadership development functions; and (3) the supportive activities. Interventions addressed on the system would focus on the previously discussed interrelated subsystems of an organization. An intervention addressing the leadership development functions would include a variety of training and development activities designed to ensure that top level administrators have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to implement change. Interventions addressing the supportive activities would includes a variety of racial/ethnic and cultural awareness enhancing activities designed to educate the entire community and create support

for the on-going large-scale intervention (B.W. Jackson, personal communication, February, 1991).

Discussion of MCOD

Although MCOD is a new and growing area, it offers great promise in addressing multicultural issues on a structural and institutional level. Because it is still in the knowledge production phase, there is little empirical and validating evidence for MCOD theory and or practices. There have been few research or outcome studies to know which MCOD tools and techniques work best. In addition, there are currently no known long-term efforts in order to understand how to change underlying cultural assumptions and structures within institutions. MCOD is not unique in these limitations. Although OD has been in existence much longer than MCOD, it still lacks definitive empirical evidence validating its theories and practices. Despite the minimal empirical data, OD remains a viable and credible option for many organizations. Similar to OD, the lack of empirical evidence of success for MCOD should not deter this new and expanding option for long-term multicultural change efforts.

Implications for MCOD in Student Affairs

Quite literally, the composition of college and university campuses is changing. Current and projected demographic data suggest that within the next 10 -15 years white male college students will be the numerical minority (Hodgkinson, 1983; 1984; 1986; Levine & Associates, 1989).

College and university administrators are searching for effective methods to prepare their campuses for these changes. Ebbers and Henry (1990) and others (e.g. Barr & Strong, 1988; Katz; 1989; Manning & Coleman-Boatwright, 1991; Smith, 1989; Woolbright, 1989) have indicated that one of the most significant tasks facing higher education administrators is to develop and cultivate multiculturally sensitive environments. The environments must have students, faculty, and staff who not only tolerate cultural diversity, but also accept appreciate, and celebrate cultural diversity. In order to create this kind of environment, the type and nature of the interventions need to change. Currently, the type of interventions which have already been instituted on many campuses are aimed primarily, if not solely, at increasing the level of racial/ethnic awareness of the students (Barr & Strong, 1988; Manning & Boatwright, 1991; Pope, 1990). The creation of multicultural campus environments requires not only interventions which focus on the level of racial/ethnic awareness of individuals, but also demands attention targeted on the institutional structures themselves (i.e.institutional policies and procedures) as well as the campus culture (i.e. norms and values) (Barr & Strong, 1989; Manning & Coleman-Boatwright, 1991; Pope, 1990; Stewart, in press).

Importantly, the attention must not stop at targeting interventions at the individual, group, and institutional levels of a college or university, instead they must be interwoven into the entire institutional planning process. Stewart (1991) presented a case study in order to "illustrate that the design and implementation of diversity planning are most effectively undertaken as an integral part of overall institutional planning, rather than as independent processes" (p. 2). In essence, in order to create multicultural campus environments, systemic change is needed.

Barr and Strong (1989) suggest three approaches to building multicultural institutions that together can combat and challenge the current institutional structures based on inequality. The first, and often most common approach, interpersonal-attitudinal, is usually the safest to use. According to Barr and Strong, this approach examines interpersonal interaction and assumes that this particular focus is enough to cause a change in power dynamics when, in fact, the typical result is for members of the institution to feel better despite little change. The second approach, economic-behavioral, also is based on maintaining institutional priorities as they already exist yet believes that emphasis on multicultural efforts and programs alone will increase the retention rate of staff, faculty, and students. While this approach may increase job

satisfaction, it also maintains the status quo including institutional racism. The final, and most radical, approach is structural-behavioral which proposes structural efforts to create a more inclusive and just institution. According to Barr and Strong (1989), this approach is rarely used because it requires confrontation and changes in the institutional structures (e.g., policies and practices) that maintain racism.

Manning and Coleman-Boatwright (1991) offer the Cultural Environment Transitions Model to characterize an institution's movement along a continuum from monocultural to multicultural and to assist student affairs educators comprehend that process. The Cultural Environment Transitions Model offers a schematic illustration of the range from monocultural to multicultural campus environments. As well, and perhaps most helpfully, the model provides a conceptual framework that offers a few concrete strategies based on the varying levels of commitment to multicultural issues evident on college and university campuses. According to Manning and Coleman-Boatwright, the model, "is not a definitive way of explaining, predicting, and controlling environments but a means to assist institutional members to define and work toward the goals of multi-culturalism" (p.6).

The Cultural Environment Transitions Model identifies a five stage continuum of development from monocultural to

multicultural. The stages are depicted in steps and plateaus identified as monocultural, awareness with inability to change, height of conflict, institutional re-birth reflective of multicultural goals, and multicultural. According to Manning and Coleman-Boatwright (1991):

> the steps in the model can be perceived as steep 90 degree angles up which community members must scale. The plateaus are not flat but can be viewed metaphorically like the rolling deck of a ship; slippery, difficult to traverse, and often treacherous. Hard won movement along the continuum is difficult to sustain (p. 7).

Another model, the SPAR model, is offered by Jacoby and Girrell (1981) which creates a comprehensive framework for addressing the needs of culturally diverse students. The four core functions of the SPAR model, which also provide the letters for the acronym SPAR are services, programs, advocacy and research. Their approach centers on work tasks or functions rather than specific units thus allowing or encouraging all staff to be involved at their specific level. The institution is expected to change in order to address multicultural issues.

Barr and Strong (1989), and Manning and Coleman-Boatwright (1991), and others (B.W. Jackson, personal communication [class lecture], Spring, 1990; Jacoby & Girrell, 1981; Katz, 1989; Pope, 1990; Stewart, 1991) recognize the need for institutional and structural interventions when assisting a campus to deal with multicultural issues.

The models offered by Barr and Strong and Manning and Coleman-Boatwright strengthen the argument for student affairs to more systemically address institutional responses to multicultural issues. However, the models fail to utilize the available data on the nature of planned change as well as the variety of diagnostic and intervention typologies and models. Manning and Coleman-Boatwright offer a general schema for understanding and diagnosing where an institution lies on a continuum moving toward multiculturalism, however, they do not suggest any tools or questions to assist that diagnostic process. MCOD fills in this gap by offering concrete behavioral science tools and techniques to design and plan for institutionalized multicultural planned change efforts.

MCOD offers a methodology with which student affairs divisions can adapt to increasingly complex and uncertain cultural, as well as, economic, and political changes. MCOD can assist a division in creating effective responses to these changes, and in many cases, can support the division in its attempts to proactively influence the strategic direction of the institution as a whole.

Student affairs practitioners can utilize MCOD to do for the creation of multicultural campuses what OD attempted to do for the integration of student development. MCOD can be utilized to ensure that a comprehensive and systemic

incorporation of diverse people, cultures, values, and norms occur on college and university campuses.

Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix

In order to analyze the multicultural change efforts utilized in student affairs, a framework must first be established. After reviewing the student affairs multicultural change effort and the more general MCOD literature, a 3 X 2 matrix has been developed (see Figure One). The Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix (MCIM) is a schematic representation of MCOD principles as applied to student affairs and higher education. One dimension of the MCIM identifies three targets of intervention: 1) individual - a student or staff member; 2) group - consisting of (a) either professional or paraprofessional staff or (b) student organization; and 3) institutional - in this case meaning the entire student affairs division. The second dimension of the MCIM classifies two levels of intervention: first- and second-order change.

Lyddon (1990) examined first- and second-order change which was initially differentiated by Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch (1974) in their discussion of family systems. Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch described first-order change as essentially "change without change" - that is a change within the system that does not create change in the structure of the system. Second-order change is "change of

change" -or any change that fundamentally alters the structure of a system.

Lyddon offered a further explanation of first- and second-order change originally conceptualized by Watzlawick et al (1974). This explanation uses fundamental mathematical concepts to distinguish between the two types of change. In arithmetic, a set of numbers may be combined in various ways using the same mathematical operation without changing the numbers or makeup of the set. For example, (3+2)+6=11 and 2+(3+6)=11 are the same numbers added in different ways yet resulting in the same answer. Lyddon believes, in such a case, "a myriad of changes in the internal state of a group (that is, changes among its members) makes no difference in its definition as a group. This type of change maintains the coherence of a system and is referred to as first-order change" (p. 122). However, if the mathematical operation is changed from addition to multiplication such as (3x2)+6=12, then a different outcome results. According to Lyddon, this change depicts a transformation in the definition of the group and is second-order change.

TARGET OF CHANGE	TYPE OF CHANGE	
	1ST ORDER CHANGE	2ND ORDER CHANGE
INDIVIDUAL	A Awareness	B Paradigm Shift
GROUP	C Membership	D Restructure
INSTITUTIONAL	E Programmatic	F Systemic

Figure 1. The Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix.

Cell A change efforts (1st order change - individual) involve education at the awareness, knowledge, or skill level. This type of educational effort is often focused on content and may involve sharing information about various racial groups. Possible examples might include: programming found during Black History Month, cross-cultural communication workshops, presentation on Japanese internment camps in the U.S., a poster series on famous people of color, or an anti-racism presentation.

A Cell B change effort (2nd order change - individual) is education aimed at the cognitive restructuring level suggesting world view or paradigm shifts. Kuh (1983) describes Kuhn's (1970) concept of a paradigm shift as a "radical change in the way in which the world is viewed"

(Kuh, 1983, p. 1). Such world view or paradigm shifts require more intensive, interactive, or experiential emphasis beyond sharing of information on content on various people of color groups (i.e. awareness). Often these interventions are more process oriented and challenge an individuals underlying assumptions. A possible example might include prolonged, extensive, and periodic consciousness raising workshops that are individually focused and experientially oriented (i.e., individual is obliged to examine belief/thought systems-- to be introspective, and self-challenging).

A Cell C change effort (1st order change - group) is a change in composition not in structure of the group (i.e., "add people and stir") in which members of previously non-represented groups are added, but there is no change of the structure, mission, or functions of the group. Quadrant C focuses on diversity in terms of numbers without examining the interpersonal and structural dynamics of a group. An example of such a change is the traditional recruitment efforts that brings in racially diverse people without altering the environment or examining and modifying unit or institutional mission.

Cell D change efforts (2nd order change - group) might be total reformation and restructuring of the group with a new, mission, goals, and members. This type of change demands examination of group makeup, values, and goals prior

to changing the group. It requires involving the new members into this self examination and planning process. It may also involve completely disbanding a group and rebuilding from the ground up.

A Cell E change effort (1st order change - institution) involves a programmatic intervention aimed at the institution which addresses multicultural issues but does not alter the underlying values and structure of the institution. Creating a new position within student affairs to address "minority concerns" or developing an on-going multicultural training program is an example of a change effort that often will not alter the institutional dynamics, values, or priorities. Another example is adding a multicultural section to a student affairs mission statement without changing evaluation or budgetary criteria. A Cell F change effort (2nd order change - institution) requires more intrusive means in which underlying institutional values, goals, and evaluation are directly examined and then linked to multicultural values and efforts. Examples include requiring goal-directed multicultural initiatives within all student affairs units which directly link the outcome of those initiatives to budget allocations or basing hiring, salary, evaluation, and promotion decisions on individual multicultural competencies (c.f. Stewart, 1991).

Summary

U.S. colleges and universities have been made aware of the projected demographic changes for start of the 21st century. In addition, with the increase in reports of ethnoviolence and what has been coined the "resurgence of racism" on college campus, an array of students of color groups on campuses have expressed being unwelcome and unsafe. For these and other reasons student affairs professionals, along with other members of the college and university communities, have expressed concern for multicultural issues.

Student affairs professionals have designed and instituted a variety of change efforts to address these issues. Although many change efforts have been attempted, as revealed by anecdotal data at professional conferences, increase in campuses hiring anti-racism consultants, workshops, newspaper reports, etc. Systematic documentation or evaluation is not reported in the professional literature. The literature published does indicate that student affairs interventions typically implemented include a series of structured awareness or prejudice reduction programs; remediation programs aimed at increasing retention of students of color; and/or campuses have hired an individual to meet the needs of students of color on campus. From examination of these efforts, at least two observations emerge that are basic to this study -- (1) a lack of

systemwide change strategies, and (2) a particular dearth of interventions targeted at the institutional level.

Systemwide multicultural change strategies would involve integrating equity and access issues into the planned change design processes (e.g., strategic planning) of student affairs divisions, rather than treating strategic planning and multicultural interventions as two separate and isolated tasks. The consolidation of these tasks would ensure that unified and coordinated efforts to create multicultural environments would permeate all subunits of the division. Moreover, interventions targeted at the institutional level are necessary to alter the basic organization and operation of the division or institution. Although interventions aimed at increasing the level of racial awareness of students are valuable, particularly on an individual basis, they have little effect on the structure and day to day functioning of the institution.

As change theories and social justice change literature suggest, long term multicultural change in institutions requires that the interventions focus on the organization as a system (Argyris, 1970; Barr & Strong, 1989; Cummings & Huse, 1989; Coyne, 1991; Foster, Jackson, Cross, Jackson, & Hardiman, 1988; Jackson & Holvino, 1988; Huse, 1978; Jamison, 1978; Katz, 1989; Katz and Miller, 1988; Katz & Torres, 1985; Lyddon, 1990; Manning & Coleman-Boatwright, 1991; Sargent, 1983). Student affairs administrators can

take the initiative to lead and model multicultural change efforts which focus on the structure mission, goals, budget, and practice of the entire division. Student affairs practitioners can develop systemic strategies to integrate cultural diversity and social justice issues into the strategic planning processes of organizational change efforts. Coyne (1991) suggests that an OD nucleus within a student affairs division that allows the university at large to profit "...creates an essential and critically important new mission..." for student affairs (p. 103). The adoption and modeling of MCOD concepts and strategies within student affairs has the potential to provide that same benefit to the division and the institution at large.

Planned change is a complex process that consciously and experimentally uses behavioral science tools and techniques to help improve the functioning of an organization. Planning intentional change around racial/ethnic issues is even more complex and challenging. MCOD is an approach to systemic planned change that warrants critical examination and intensive experimentation in the years ahead. MCOD has promise as an institutional change strategy.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

This study employed the survey method of inquiry. Survey research involves systematic data collection and often is used to describe and explore relationships between variables. The methodology involves selecting a sample of respondents and collecting information on variables of interest through either interviews or questionnaires. Borg and Gall (1989) contend that survey research is a distinctive methodology with a long historical tradition that can be traced back as far as the ancient Egyptian population counts. Fowler (1985) and Borg and Gall conclude that the survey method of research is very useful and appropriate in gathering descriptive and normative data. The survey method is the most appropriate when the researcher seeks to determine the status quo (Kerlinger, 1964). In the field of education, survey research makes up a significant proportion of the research conducted (Borg & Gall, 1989). Survey research often is the methodology of choice because, if done correctly, data can be collected from a small sample and generalized to a large population.

This chapter discusses the research methodology used to conduct the study. Following an examination of the research questions and hypotheses, four primary areas are explored:

1) participants; 2) instrumentation; 3) research design and procedures and; 4) data collection and analysis.

This study focused on the research problem identified in Chapter One - the lack of information on the multiracial interventions utilized in student affairs divisions across the nation. It was from this research problem that the following research question were derived:

1.) What is the frequency of multiracial interventions occurring in student affairs divisions across the country?

2.) What is the frequency and type of first- and second-order multiracial interventions occurring in student affairs?

3.) What target of change (individual, group, or institution) is most frequently focused on in multiracial interventions in student affairs?

4.) Are the multiracial interventions currently being used by student affairs employing MCOD strategies?

Considering these research questions, the following hypotheses were developed:

(1) the frequency of multiracial interventions is not related to the size of the institution;

(2) the frequency of multiracial interventions is not related to geographic location;

(3) at the individual level, the multiracial change efforts toward first order change are not equal to the efforts toward second order change;

(4) at the group level, the multiracial change efforts toward first order change are not equal to the efforts toward second-order change;

(5) at the institutional level, the multiracial change efforts toward first-order change are not equal to the efforts toward second-order change;

(6) the primary target of the multiracial change effort is not related to the size of the institution;

(7) the primary target of the multiracial change effort is not related to the geographic location; and

(8) MCOD strategies currently are not being used in student affairs.

Participants

This study focused on the multiracial change interventions utilized in student affairs divisions on college and university campuses. Information was gathered from Chief Student Affairs Officers (CSAOs), or designee most knowledgeable of this area, who were assumed to have the most comprehensive view of the multiracial change interventions in their division. The participants for this study were drawn from the population of CSAOs who are

members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA). NASPA membership was targeted for two reasons: 1) a large proportion of CSAOs are members of NASPA, and 2) NASPA maintains an updated mailing list of CSAOs who are members of NASPA. NASPA makes these mailing labels available provided that the research projects meet NASPA's stringent guidelines. A proposal requesting a copy of the mailing labels of CSAOs was submitted to the NASPA Research and Program Development Division. NASPA supported the proposal and made the mailing labels available for this study.

A random sample of 225 CSAOs (21%), who were drawn from the 1065 NASPA CSAOs at predominately white four-year colleges or universities in the United States, received a mailed questionnaire soliciting responses concerning their campus demographics and multiracial change efforts conducted on their campuses. A total of 126 questionnaires (56%) were returned. Of the 126 returned, 13 were judged unusable due to extensive omissions by the respondents. Hence, 113 were deemed usable, resulting in a usable response rate of 50%.

Demographics

The total student enrollment of the 113 responding institutions ranged from 500 to 35,000 students. Table 1 shows the enrollment size of the participating institutions in both numbers and percentages of the sample. As shown in

the table, just over 70% of the respondents were from schools with enrollments of 10,000 students or less.

Table 1 Enrollment Size of Participating Institutions

Enrollment	N	% of sample
500 - 5000	55	48.7
5001-10,00	25	22.1
10,001-15,000	13	11.5
15,000-20,000	6	5.3
20,001-25,000	7	6.2
25,001-30,000	3	2.7
30,001-35,000	4	3.5
Total	113	

Note. M=6449; SD=6166.

The geographic location of the participating institutions is shown in Table 2. Since all of the responding institutions were from the 48 contiguous states of the United States, the institutions were categorized regionally into four quadrants -- East, West, South, and

Central. As shown in the table, respondents from the East and South comprised nearly 64% of the participants.

Table 2 Region of Participating Institutions

Region	N	% of sample
East	38	33.6
West	14	12.4
Central	27	23.9
South	34	30.1
Total	113	

Participants were asked to indicate the size of their student affairs professional staff (excluding undergraduate, clerical, and maintenance personnel) and to list the number of individuals in each of the following racial categories: African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic/Latino-American, American Indian, Caucasian-American, Other, and Foreign National. The size of student affairs staffs ranged from 5 to 225 with a mean of 49 and a standard deviation of 46.9.

The racial classification of the student affairs professional staff is shown in Table 3. As shown in the table, the vast majority of the staff members in the study were White (84%). Staff of color constitute only 14% of the student affairs staff represented in this study.

Table 3 Racial Classification of Professional Staff

Race	N	% of sample
African-American	519	9
Asian-American	61	1
Latino-American	185	3
American Indian	64	1
White-American	4707	84
Other	10	.1
Foreign National	26	.4
Total staff of color	865	14[a]
Total all staff	5572	

Note. [a]Staff of color does not include Other or Foreign.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire was deemed the most suitable method for collecting data in this study primarily because the data were dispersed throughout the country. Great care and attention were given to ensure that the questionnaire constructed for this study was clear, concise, and easily understood. As well, most of the questions were written in the closed form (permitting only certain responses, such as Likert-scale responses, yes or no answers, or ranking of specified items). The closed form ensured that quantification and analysis of the results could be conducted efficiently (Borg & Gall, 1989). Some questions on the survey dealt specifically with demographic information (e.g., size of institution, number of students of color, etc.). Other questions examined the types of multiracial change interventions currently utilized on the respondent's campus. The Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix (MCIM) was the primary conceptual tool used to construct the questionnaire. One of the primary underpinnings of the MCIM and its conceptualization of multiracial interventions for this study is the notion of 1st and 2nd order change. A significant number of items in the questionnaire were meant to distinguish between those two types of change thus enabling one to assess the degree to which MCOD strategies were being utilized. A sample of the questionnaire is provided (see Appendix A, in pocket).

Because obtaining accurate or appropriate responses from respondents and creating an effective, valid, and reliable questionnaire are especially problematic issues in survey research, additional attention was given during questionnaire construction and data coding and analysis. Careful construction of the questionnaire and the assistance of survey construction specialists, multicultural experts, and student affairs experts aided in offsetting these concerns.

One of the difficult aspects of creating a valid and reliable questionnaire was finding word usage that was universal and conveyed the meaning intended by the author. Chapter One describes the need for accurate language and makes a case for using the term multicultural only when addressing the widest range of human diversity and using the term multiracial when focusing on racial differences. However, as stated in Chapter One, common usage still relies on the term multicultural even when discussing only racial issues. For that reason the questionnaire for this study used the term multicultural even though it was only focusing on multiracial issues. By relying on common usage it was hopeful that the questionnaire results would be more accurate and genuinely reflect common practices.

The creation of the questionnaire for this study involved three phases. The first phase was an extensive review of the literature as specified in Chapter Two.

Significant attention was focused on the organization development and multicultural organization development literature. This literature review led to the creation of the MCIM. Any tasks, strategies, activities or organizational components that were identified as possibly contributing to the multicultural nature of an organization were noted and later incorporated into specific questions for the instrument. Upon completion of this process, the second phase began. Many questions were generated in a brainstorm-type manner in which all possible questions were quickly written down without evaluation. This second phase also involved an initial review and rewrite of the items as they were written into a questionnaire format. The questionnaire content and the method of statistical analysis were designed to ensure that the information obtained would respond to the hypotheses generated for this study

The third and final phase of the process involved obtaining feedback from several experts in each of the following areas: 1) multicultural organization development, 2) student affairs, and 3) test construction. This feedback process occurred in several steps and the final one involved obtaining critiques from student affairs professionals who were also experts in multicultural issues in higher education. In some respects, this last group served as a quasi-pilot study of the questionnaire. Their feedback was

used to revise the questionnaire and create a final version for this study.

Research Design and Procedures

For the purposes of this descriptive study, the research design involved collecting data to ascertain what multiracial interventions are currently utilized by student affairs divisions on college and university campuses. These data were collected through the use of a questionnaire specifically constructed for this study.

Data collection was designed to ensure anonymity. Each questionnaire had an identification number for mailing purposes only. Names of individual respondents or their institutions were never placed on the questionnaire. All responses were treated confidentially and were used only in summary tabulations and commentary.

Because ensuring adequate response rates is vital to the success of survey research, the following methods were utilized to address those concerns: repeated contacts, type of postage, use of return envelopes, and survey length (Aiken, 1988; Armstrong & Lusk, 1987; Fink & Kosecoff, 1985; Fox, Crask, & Kim, 1988; Hambleton, 1990). According to Hambleton (1990), repeated contacts (pre-notification letters, survey completed postcards, personal letters, follow-up letters with another copy of the questionnaire enclosed, and telephone calls), help to increase survey response rates. In fact, Hambleton states that "a follow-up

mailing is worth about 20% more returns," (Handout No. 3, p.51).

In order to increase the return rate of surveys, this study utilized the previously described repeated contacts. Pre-notification letters were mailed on March 30 to prepare the participants for the upcoming survey (see Appendix B). The survey questionnaires then were mailed with a cover letter on April 3 (see Appendix C). Post card reminders were sent on April 16 in order to encourage participation in the study (see Appendix D). A follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents on April 28 with an additional questionnaire to make one last effort at encouraging involvement in the study (see Appendix E).

The use of return envelopes and the type of postage used also can increase return rates (Armstrong, 1987; Fox, Crask, & Kim, 1988). This study utilized first class postage stamps and return envelopes were provided. The length of the questionnaire is often a factor in the percentage of responses received, but according to Hambleton (1990), the research results are mixed as to whether questionnaire length significantly affects response. However, the length of the survey was considered in order to minimize potential problems.

Although all of the recommended procedures for increasing return rates were followed, this study yielded only a 56% return rate, with only 50% of responses being

usable. While it is not clear why only 56% of the questionnaires were returned for analysis, time availability may have been a contributing factor since the study was conducted during the latter half of the spring semester.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data were collected at a post office box in Iowa City, Iowa. The raw data were coded and entered into a Wylbur computer file at the University of Iowa Computer Center and analyzed using SPSS-X.

Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and the percentage of respondents for each research question, were examined. Additionally, the MCIM was used to analyze and understand the multiracial change efforts of the responding institutions. Based on these results, observations are offered regarding the degree to which type of MCOD efforts are currently being utilized in student affairs.

Cross-tabulation statistics, specifically chi-square measures, were computed to understand the relationship between the location and size of the institutions and responses on the questionnaires. The chi-square statistic was chosen because even though it is a common statistic it is quite powerful. In addition, because the data analyzed were categorical and the study's sample size, the chi-square was the chosen statistic.

Another type of non-parametric statistic, the sign test, was used to compare the representation of 1st and 2nd order multiracial change efforts. The sign test is the oldest nonparametric test and is a special case of the binomial test which tests probabilities between two cases. Although in many situations where the sign test may be used there are other more powerful non-parametric test which could be used in its place, the sign test is actually simpler and easier to use and does not require special tables to find the critical region (Conover, 1971). The sign test is considered a very versatile and malleable statistic.

The remaining two chapters also explore and present overall patterns and themes of the data.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to identify and examine the multiracial change efforts currently utilized by student affairs professionals on college and university campuses. The conceptual foundation for much of the statistical analysis was the Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix (MCIM) which was created as part of this study.

This chapter presents an analysis of the data. The four primary areas of analysis targeted for this study and examined in this chapter include: 1) the number of multiracial interventions across different institutional enrollment levels and region; 2) the primary target of the multiracial change interventions (individual, group, or institution) across enrollment and region; 3) the type of multiracial interventions (1^{st}- or 2^{nd}-order) most frequently utilized by the respondents; and 4) the extent to which MCOD strategies were employed by the respondents.

Frequency of Multiracial Interventions

The number of multiracial interventions reported by the 113 institutions in the past two years ranged from 0 to 300. The following definition of multiracial interventions was shared with the study participants:

"all those events, services, programs, activities, brochures, offices, policies, procedures, etc. that are specifically designed to address racial issues or concerns or the needs of people of color."

Table 4 shows the range of frequency of interventions reported by the participating institutions in both numbers and percentages. As shown in the table, nearly 60% of participants report offering five or fewer multiracial interventions during the past two years.

Table 4 Frequency of Multiracial Interventions

No. of Interventions	No. of Interventions	No. of Institutions	% of Respondents
0		12	10.6
1		8	7.1
2		8	7.1
3		10	8.8
4		10	8.8
5		13	11.5
6		6	5.3
7		1	.9
8		2	1.8
10		9	8.0
11		1	.9
12		6	5.3
15		2	1.8
20		9	8.0
25		3	2.7
30		1	.9
40		4	3.5
50		3	2.7
100		2	1.8
105		1	.9
300		2	1.8
Total	1933	113	

Note. M=17; Mode=5; Median=5; SD= 42.3.

Utilizing the variables total student enrollment and geographic region of the participating institutions, two chi-square analyses were performed to examine the number of multiracial interventions implemented during the last two years. Table 5 (page 99), shows the results of the first chi-square analysis of enrollment and frequency of multiracial interventions. For this analysis, student enrollment was divided into two categories: (1) below 5200 and (2) 5201 to 35,000. These two categories were chosen based on the enrollment median which was 5200.

The number of multiracial interventions was divided into three categories: 0-3 interventions, 4-10 interventions, and 11 interventions and above. These categories were chosen based on dividing the range of multiracial interventions (0-300) into thirds. As shown in Table 5 (page 99), the results of the chi-square analysis were not significant at the .05 level thus lending some support to the first hypothesis by illustrating that there was no relationship between the size of institution and the frequency of multiracial interventions (see Table 5, page 99).

Table 6 (page 100), shows the results of the second chi-square analysis. This analysis examined the relationship between the geographic location of the institution and the frequency of multiracial interventions. The results of this chi-square analysis were not significant

at the .05 level thus supporting hypothesis number two which stated that the frequency of multiracial interventions was not related to geographic location (see Table 6, page 100).

Table 5 Number of Interventions by Enrollment Size

	Enrollment	
	Size 1[a]	Size 2
No. of Interventions		
0-3	22	14
4-10	19	22
11-300	13	21

Note. X^2 (2, N=113) = 4.72, p>.05.
[a]Size 1 = 500-5200 students, Size 2 = 5201-35,000.

Table 6 Number of Interventions by Region

	Region			
	E[a]	W	S	C
No. of Efforts				
0-3	13	3	10	12
4-10	7	7	12	15
11-300	18	4	5	7

Note. X^2 (6, N=113) = 4.21, p>.05.
[a]E = East, W = West, S = South, and C = Central.

Primary Target of Multiracial Change Interventions

The multiracial interventions offered by student affairs divisions typically identify at least three primary targets of the interventions. The target is defined as the *intended* recipient of the intervention. Respondents were asked to choose the primary target of the majority of the multiracial interventions within student affairs on their campus. The questionnaire listed the following choices: 1) individual (an individual student or staff member), 2) group (a student group, staff unit, or department), or 3) the

entire division (e.g., student affairs structure, policies, procedures, hiring and evaluation practices, management practices). For this study two chi-square tests were completed to examine the primary target of interventions utilizing the variables of total student enrollment and geographic region of the institution. Table 7 shows the result of the first chi-square analysis of enrollment and target of intervention. As shown in the table, the size of enrollment had no effect on the choice of primary target of the interventions. Neither the large or small schools targeted the Student Affairs division for very many interventions. In fact, as revealed in Table 7 (page 102), 93% of the interventions for the large schools and 87.4% for the small schools were targeted at either the individual or group. The result of this chi-square test lends some support to hypothesis number six, which stated that the choice of the primary target of intervention was not related to the size of the institution.

Similarly, hypothesis number seven was not rejected by the chi-square test. As shown in Table 8 (page 103), the geographic location of the institution had no effect on the choice of primary target for interventions. Over 90% of the interventions from the four combined regions targeted either the individual or group, with well over 50% of those having the group as the primary target of the interventions.

Table 7 Primary Target of Interventions by Enrollment Size

	Enrollment	
	Size 1	Size 2
Target		
Individual	23	15
Group	26	38
Division	7	4

Note. X^2 (2, N=113) = 4.74, p>.05.
[a]Size 1 = 500-5200 students, Size 2 = 5201 - 35,000.

Table 8 Primary Target of Interventions by Region

	Region			
	E[a]	W	S	C
Target				
Individual	21%	43%	44%	35%
Group	71%	43%	48%	53%
Division	8%	14%	7%	12%

Note. $X^2(6, N=113) = 6.12$, $p>.05$.
[a]E=East, W=West, S=South, and C=Central.
Due to rounding of figures, not all columns equal 100.

Type of Multiracial Interventions

To determine the type (1st- or 2nd-order) of multiracial interventions utilized by student affairs divisions, another type of non-parametric analysis was completed. The non-parametric statistic used for this analysis was the sign test. Three sign tests were completed, one for each of the primary targets of change (individual, group, and division). Respondents were asked to rank the primary purpose of their multicultural

interventions for each target area. For example, respondents were asked whether the purpose of their multiracial interventions targeted at the individual level was to provide information, examine prejudice, examine underlying values or beliefs, or create an internal paradigm shift. These items distinguished each respondent as utilizing either 1st- or 2nd-order multiracial interventions.

Table 9 shows the results of the sign test of the multiracial interventions at the individual level. As shown in the table, respondents indicated an almost equal amount of support for interventions targeted at 1st- and 2nd- order change. Therefore, when identifying the primary purpose of the multiracial interventions on their campuses, respondents reported relatively equal reliance on interventions representing 1st- and 2nd-order change at the individual level. There was no significant difference between the prevalence of the two types of interventions thus provided basis for rejecting hypothesis number three in which it was predicted that the number of 1st- and 2nd-order interventions would not be equal at the individual level (see Table 9, page 105).

Table 9 First vs Second Order Change Targeted at the Individual

First-Order	56	respondents
Second-Order	57	respondents
	113	Total respondents

Note. Z=.0000; 2-tailed p=1.000.

Table 10 shows the results of the sign test of multiracial interventions at the group level. As shown in the table, respondents indicated an almost equal amount of support for interventions targeted at 1st- and 2nd-order change. Therefore, when identifying the primary purpose of the multiracial interventions on their campuses, respondents reported relatively equal reliance on interventions representing 1st- and 2nd-order change at the group level. There was no significant difference between the prevalence of the two types of interventions thus providing basis for rejecting the fourth hypothesis in which it was predicted that 1st- and 2nd-order interventions would not be equal at the group level (see Table 10, page 106).

Table 10 First vs Second Order Change Targeted at the Group

Cases		
First-Order	57	respondents
Second-Order	56	respondents
	113	Total respondents

Note. Z=.0000; 2-tailed p=1.000.

Table 11 shows the results of the sign test of multiracial interventions targeted at the division level. As shown in the table, respondents indicated profoundly different levels of support for interventions targeted at both 1st- and 2nd-order change. When identifying the primary purpose of the multiracial interventions on their campuses, respondents reported a much greater reliance on 1st-order change at the division level. Since a statistically significant difference occurred between the prevalence of the two types of interventions, hypothesis number five, in which it was predicted that the number of 1st- and 2nd-order interventions would not be equal at the division level, was accepted (see Table 11, page 107).

Table 11 First vs Second Order Change Targeted at the Division

Cases		
First-Order	69	respondents
Second-Order	44	respondents
	113	Total respondents

Note. Z=2.26; 2-tailed p=.024.

Use of MCOD Strategies

In order to determine if MCOD strategies currently were being utilized by the respondents, another sign test was computed taking into account five items from the questionnaire. These questions were identified as being the most significant in differentiating between types of interventions as conceptualized in the MCIM. For the purposes of this research question, MCOD strategies were 2nd order interventions which were targeted at the divisional or structural level.

The questions involved were: #10 (whether division-wide student affairs statements such as selection criteria or mission statements included a specific reference to multicultural issues?); #34 (whether the primary target of the majority of the multicultural interventions was targeted

at the individual, group, or entire division?); #35 (whether most of the multicultural interventions targeted at the individual level were 1st or 2nd order change efforts?); #36 (whether most of the multicultural interventions targeted at the group level were 1st or 2nd order change efforts?); and #37 (whether most of the multicultural interventions targeted at the divisional level were 1st or 2nd order change efforts?). Based on responses to these questions, respondent institutions were then distinguished as either having or not having an MCOD strategy.

Table 12 shows the results of the sign test of the prevalence of MCOD strategies being used by the respondents. As shown in the table, there was a significant difference between the prevalence or importance of MCOD strategies for the respondents thus providing basis for accepting hypothesis eight in which it was predicted that MCOD strategies currently were not being used in student affairs. The number of respondents supporting questionnaire items which identified their interventions as being based in MCOD theory or strategies was quite small (N=6) and indicates the rarity of 2nd-order multicultural interventions targeted at the institutional level (see Table 12, page 109).

Table 12 Use of MCOD Strategies

Cases		
MCOD	6	respondents
Not MCOD	107	respondents
	113	Total respondents

Note. Z=9.4; 2-tailed p=.0000.

Summary

This study identified, examined, and codified the multiracial interventions currently used by student affairs professionals on college and university campuses. To accomplish that goal this study tested eight hypotheses; six hypothesis were accepted and two were rejected. Listed below each hypothesis and the results of the corresponding statistical analyses are summarized:

(1) the frequency of multiracial interventions is not related to the size of the institution (Hypothesis was accepted);

(2) the frequency of multiracial interventions is not related to geographic location (Hypothesis was accepted);

(3) at the individual level, the multiracial change efforts toward first order change are not equal to

the efforts toward second order change (Hypothesis was rejected);

(4) at the group level, the multiracial change efforts toward first order change are not equal to the efforts toward second-order change (Hypothesis was rejected);

(5) at the institutional level, the multiracial change efforts toward first-order change are not equal to the efforts toward second-order change (Hypothesis was accepted);

(6) the primary target of the multiracial change effort is not related to the size of the institution (Hypothesis was accepted);

(7) the primary target of the multiracial change effort is not related to the geographic location (Hypothesis was accepted); and

(8) MCOD strategies currently are not being used in student affairs (Hypothesis was accepted).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Creating inclusive, affirming, multicultural campuses has been a goal of college and universities for at least the past twenty years. Although a number of responses within student affairs divisions have been attempted, there is little published data regarding the type of interventions involved or how successful they have been. Until this type of information is more readily available, it will continue to be difficult to make informed and effective decisions about which interventions or what type of interventions will help create a multicultural campus environment. This study was designed to provide that information. Using a conceptual model created for this study, the Multicultural Change Intervention Matrix (MCIM) was developed. The MCIM is a framework for classifying and understanding the range of activities that student affairs divisions currently use to address multiracial issues.

This chapter discusses and integrates this study's findings. Limitations of the findings and methodology of this study are explored as are implications for future research on multiracial interventions and issues in student affairs. Finally, possible directions for future research of the MCIM are presented.

Frequency of Multiracial Interventions

There has been much discussion within the student affairs profession concerning the frequency of multiracial interventions on college and university campuses. Depending on who is talking, the position taken may be either that on the nation level campuses are doing too much -- making too many multiracial interventions and neglecting other, more important areas; or that campuses are doing too little -- attempting few if any multiracial interventions. The problem with the discussion has been that it has been based almost exclusively on anecdotal information or personal opinions and assumptions. Empirical evidence to support those assumptions has been lacking. This study provides some of the empirical evidence to expand and clarify the discussion.

The results of this study confirm the position of those who assert that few multiracial interventions are being attempted. While the number of multiracial interventions ranged from 0-300, the mean number of interventions reported over a two year period was 17 with a SD of 42.3. Five schools reported interventions ranging from 100-300 thus significantly skewing the distribution. The most often reported number (or mode) of interventions was five (thirteen schools reported this number), and the second most often reported number of interventions was zero (twelve schools reported this number).

As previously discussed, nearly 60% of the respondents reported offering five or fewer multiracial interventions during the past two years. When considering the amount of total interventions that a student affairs division makes in a two year period, the finding of only five multiracial interventions suggests a deficiency within environs that involve diverse cultures functioning in demonstratably monocultural environments.

This study further examined the frequency of multiracial interventions by institutional enrollment size and geographic region. No significant differences were identified for either category. These variables and other institutional variables (e.g., public vs. private, four-year vs. two year, urban vs. rural) need further study to ensure fuller understanding of what factors appear to contribute to creating effective multiracial interventions and multiracially sensitive campuses.

Type of Multiracial Interventions

One of the primary variables identified as part of the MCIM for this study was the type of multiracial intervention utilized by student affairs professionals. The distinction between 1st- and 2nd-order interventions was important in its effort to identify the type of multiracial interventions attempted. As student affairs divisions, in service to the university and its mission, seek to become more multiracial, interventions are needed which fundamentally alter the

structure, and its functions, of the divisions. This type of change is the 2nd-order change discussed in this study.

The results of this study indicate that student affairs divisions are instituting an almost equal number of 1st and 2nd-order changes at both the individual and group level. This finding may suggest that student affairs practitioners are attempting to create significant change with individuals and groups when developing multiracial interventions.

Conversely, significant differences in prevalence and importance were found to exist between 1st-and 2nd-order change interventions targeted at the division level. This finding suggests that students affairs practitioners are attempting fewer 2nd-order than 1st-order change interventions - a finding consistent with the assertions of Barr and Strong (1989), Manning and Coleman-Boatwright (1991), and Stewart (1991) that the multicultural interventions currently being utilized on college campuses focus on the level of racial awareness of individuals and do not target institutional structures.

Primary Target of Multiracial Interventions

As stated previously, three primary targets of interventions were identified for this study: individuals, groups, and divisions. Respondents were asked to choose the primary target of the majority of the multiracial interventions on their campuses. Enrollment size and geographic region were considered as factors that might

contribute to the choice of primary target for multiracial interventions. No significant differences were identified for either category. That is, the size and location of an institution did not appear to have an impact on the primary target of the multiracial interventions. According to the results of this study, all three possible targets of intervention were equally viable. Although additional study of contributing factors needs to occur, overall, results of this study suggests that institutional size and geographic location does not influence the frequency and type of multiracial interventions on college and university campuses.

Use of MCOD Strategies

Multicultural organization development (MCOD) strategies and their applications are in the process of being identified and clarified. This study attempted to introduce these concepts to the profession of student affairs. For the purposes of this study, and according to the MCIM, MCOD strategies were defined primarily as 2nd-order interventions. Since the literature in this area is so new, little is known about how frequently these types of strategies are used in student affairs. This study provides additional information and data for clarifying the applications of MCOD in student affairs.

An assumption embedded in this study was that there is minimal use of MCOD strategies in student affairs. This

assumption was confirmed by the study's results. Only six of the 113 respondents supported the questionnaire items which identified their interventions as being based in MCOD theory or strategies, further supporting the notion that systemic multiracial change strategies are not utilized in student affairs. There remains a need for analysis of other examples of significant change strategies in higher education in general and specifically in student affairs.

Limitations of this Study

Although the present study is crucial in understanding multiracial interventions in student affairs, several limitations must be discussed when interpreting its results. The limitations of this study can be categorized into several areas. First, all data collected were self-reported and are therefore subject to possible social desirability biases. The confounding factor of social desirability, or respondents presenting the answers they believe the researchers want to see, seems especially likely in this type of research. In many aspects related to multiracial issues, whether it be programming, recruiting, or other related activities in higher education, individuals are often not as far along in their multiracial efforts as they would like to be which may affect the results they report. Another related concern came from gathering data for each institution from the perspective of only one individual. While the purpose of utilizing one respondent per

institution was to minimize conflicting data, it inherently offered only one person's perception or point of view.

Another major limitation had to do with the sample used in this study. While every effort was made to collect a random and diverse sample and the return rate of 56% is reasonable for this study, the generalizability of this data was still somewhat limited. A larger return rate would have given more credibility to the generalizability of this study. In addition, data were not collected on certain demographic variables which also could have had a significant effect on the multiracial interventions attempted by the sampled institutions. For example, type of institution (e.g., public vs. private) or setting (e.g., rural vs. urban) are two possible contributing factors that were not assessed. More research needs to be done with possibly a larger sample size before any conclusive results can be stated.

A third limitation has to do with the MCIM itself which was the basis of the questionnaire and the research questions and hypotheses. This model is in its early stages of formation and needs more refinement and exploration. While this study has collected useful data, it does not in any way validate this model. There were no measures incorporated into this study which would assess the validity of this model or its underlying MCOD theory. Future research that examines the heuristic value and credibility

of the MCIM would be important to establish its viability in the field of student affairs.

The fourth and final limitation of this study deals with the instrumentation itself. While great effort was extended in creating an effective, valid, and reliable questionnaire, some of the responses received indicate that some of the questions were ambiguous and possibly misinterpreted by the respondents. In addition, it is not clear to what degree this questionnaire is an accurate reflection of the MCIM. If this questionnaire is to be used in future studies, additional studies must be completed that statistically examine its reliability and validity as an assessment tool.

There were many theoretical and methodological challenges in creating the MCIM and designing this study. The student affairs and social change literatures have few examples on which to base work on MCOD. Much work needs to be done to refine the underpinning theories which guided this study as well as to cultivate and improve the assessment tools available to do credible research. Clearly the questions raised in doing this study need to be examined so that the process of doing multiracial research in student affairs can be refined.

Implications for Future Research

There are many possible areas for future research on multiracial interventions in student affairs, the MCIM, as

well as MCOD in general. This study identified significant variables to be examined when addressing issues surrounding multiracial change efforts in student affairs. In addition to the type of intervention and the target for which it is intended, additional variables need to be explored. For example, what are the different types of interventions and how do they relate to the MCIM? Are experiential interventions more likely to be 2nd-order? Is it possible to classify an intervention based on its type of activities? In addition, examining related variables such as type of school and cultural diversity of the surrounding community would be important in order to understand what creates change in multiracial understanding and communication.

A follow-up to this type of conceptual and assessment work is doing evaluation and outcome research. What interventions are most effective? Finding ways to actually measure and make distinctions between 1st- and 2nd- order change efforts would advance this research area greatly. Completing both cross-sectional and longitudinal studies examining the effectiveness of multiracial interventions on the individual, group, and division level would create rich data for student affairs practitioners and researchers. Utilizing a case study approach as a means of indepth research could offer even more understanding of the process and outcome of multiracial change interventions in higher education and student affairs. By studying the multiracial

change efforts of one or more campuses, researchers could identify the factors and variables involved in making such interventions successful.

Additional work needs to be done with both the underlying model (MCIM) and the instrumentation designed to measure its presence in student affairs. In addition to the work on achieving reliability and validity data for the instrument, more research needs to be completed on further clarification of MCOD theory and its application to student affairs. Using experts in the area of MCOD and in student affairs to refine the MCIM and its instrumentation seems likely to be a fruitful approach to expanding this area of research.

More research is needed for the MCIM specifically as well as multiracial interventions in student affairs in general so as to increase our understanding of and ability to create more inclusive, affirming, and multicultural campuses. Until our knowledge and awareness increase, we will be unable to create the campuses and therefore society for which we strive.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL INTERVENTIONS CURRENTLY USED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISIONS

APPENDIX B

PRE-NOTIFICATION LETTER

DATE

Dear Colleague:

Your help is needed with a major study currently being conducted on multicultural issues on campus life. Many student affairs professionals on college and university campuses are attempting to find effective methods of creating culturally diverse or multicultural campuses. Unfortunately, the literature offers only a sketchy idea of what campuses are doing and how they are doing it. Without such information, and without a clear understanding of what a diverse campus would entail, sensible and effective interventions are difficult to formulate. Clearly this project reflects the concerns some of you have expressed about these issues.

I am a doctoral candidate at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst and am writing my dissertation on multicultural campus environments. I would very much like to get information from you on this subject. Recognizing that no single approach to these issues will work for all institutions; we want to learn what chief student affairs officers and from various institutions have implemented through their staff on their campuses to create a multicultural environment. It is for that reason that I ask you to take a few minutes to answer a survey which will be mailed to you within the next few weeks.

Be assured that your responses will be **treated confidentially** and will be used only in summary tabulations and commentary. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that I may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name or institution will never be placed on the questionnaire.

As a small token of my gratitude for your assistance with this study, enclosed with the survey you will find a selected bibliography of multicultural resources for higher education. I realize that this bibliography does not adequately compensate you for your valuable time, but I do believe you will find it helpful. Please accept it as my gift to you for completing the survey.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this letter. Please look for the survey which will be mailed in one week.

Sincerely,

Raechele L.Pope

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER

DATE

Dear Colleague:

Last week you received a letter describing a study I am conducting and asking for your assistance in gathering information concerning multicultural change interventions in student affairs on college and university campuses. I would very much like to get information from you on this subject.

I hope you will complete the enclosed questionnaire. It should be returned to: Raechele L. Pope, P. O. Box 2981, Iowa City, Iowa, 52241, if possible by **DATE**.

Again, please be assured that your responses will be **treated confidentially** and will be used only in summary tabulations and commentary. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that I can check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name or institution will never be placed on the questionnaire.

As a small token of my gratitude for your assistance with this study, enclosed you will find a selected bibliography of multicultural resources for higher education. I realize that this bibliography does not adequately compensate you for your valuable time, but I do believe you will find it helpful. Please accept it as my gift to you for completing the enclosed survey.

Thank you so much for your assistance. Enclosed is a self-addressed stamped envelope. If you have questions, please call Raechele L. Pope (319) 337-8948.

Sincerely,

Raechele L. Pope

APPENDIX D

POST CARD REMINDER

DATE

Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago a questionnaire seeking your assistance in gathering information concerning multicultural change interventions in student affairs on college and university campuses was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned it to me please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. It is extremely important your input be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the multicultural change interventions occurring in student affairs on college and university campuses today.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me immediately at (319) 337-8948 and I will mail another one to you today.

Sincerely,

Raechele L. Pope

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

DATE

Dear Colleague:

About three weeks ago I wrote to your requesting your assistance with a study I am conducting on multicultural change interventions in student affairs on college and university campuses. As of today, I have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

I am conducting this study because I believe this study reflects some of the concerns Chief Student Affairs Officers, like yourself, have expressed regarding multicultural issues. This study will hopefully provide some answers to those concerns.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. For a truly representative study, each questionnaire must be completed. In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed. **Please take the time to complete and return the questionnaire immediately.**

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Raechele L. Pope

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adolphus, S. H. (Ed.). (1984). Equity postponed: Continuing barriers to higher education in the 1980s. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Aiken, J.I., Duncan, J.P., & McClintock, D.H. (1975).Intra-university consultants: An unused resource. NASPA Journal, 12, 234-240.

Aiken, L. R. (1988). The problem of nonresponse in survey research. Journal of Experimental Education, 53, 116-119.

Alderfer, C.P. (1977). Organization Development. Annual Review of Psychology, 28, 197-223.

Ambler, D. A. (1989). Designing and managing programs: The administrator role. In U. Delworth, G. R. Hanson, & Associates, Student services: A handbook for the profession (2nd ed.) (pp. 247-264). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Association of State College and Universities (1986). Minorities in public higher education at a turning point. Washington, DC: AASCU.

American College Unions International (1987). Definition of multiculturalism. Executive Committee of ACU-I. Bloomington, IN.: ACU-I.

Anti-semitic incidents up sharply on campuses. (1991, February 13). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A2.

Appleton, J.R., Briggs, C.M., & Rhatigan, J.J. (1978). Pieces of eight: Rites, roles, and styles of the dean of eight who have been there. Portland, Oregon: NASPA Institute of Research and Development.

Argyris, C. (1970). Intervention theory and method: A behavioral science view. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.

Armstrong, S., & Lusk, E. (1987). Return postage in mail surveys; A meta-analysis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 233-248.

Astin, A. (1984). A look at pluralism in the contemporary student population. NASPA Journal, 21 (3), 2-11.

Astin, A. (1982). Minorities in American higher education: Recent trends, current prospects, and recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Aulepp L., & Delworth, U. (1978). A team approach to environmental assessment. In J.H. Banning (Ed.), Campus ecology: A perspective for student affairs. NASPA Monograph. Cincinnati, OH.: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Baldridge, V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: Wiley.

Baldridge, V., & Deal T. (1975). Managing change in educational organizations. New York: Wiley.

Banning, J.H., & Hughes, B.M. (1986). Designing the campus environment with commuter students. NASPA Journal, 24, 17-24.

Banning, J.H., & Kaiser, L. (1974). An ecological perspective and model for campus design. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 52, 370-375.

Barnes, S.F., Morton, W.E., & Austin, A.O. (1983). The call for accountability, the struggle for program definition in student affairs. NASPA Journal, 20, 10-20.

Barr, D.J., & Strong L.J. (1989). Embracing multiculturalism: The existing contradictions. NASPA Journal, 26, 85-90.

Barr, M.J., Keating, L.A., and Associates. (1985). Developing effective student services programs: Systematic approaches for practitioners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bartunek, J., & Moch, M.K. (1987). First-order, second-order, and third-order change and organization development interventions: A cognitive approach. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 23, 483-500.

Benderson, A. (Ed.). (1988). Minority students in higher education (Focus No. 22). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Bennis, W. G. (1973). An OD expert in the cat bird's seat. Journal of Higher Education, 44, 389-398.

Bennis, W.G., Benne, K.D., & Chinn, R. (Eds.). (1985). The planning of change (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Berman, W.F. (1980). MBO in student personnel: Can it work? In C.H. Foxley (Ed.), Applying Management Techniques (pp. 55-68). New Directions for Student Services (No. 9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organizations and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blaesser, W.W. (1978). Organization change and student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 19, 109-118.

Blaesser, W.W. (1986). The future of student personnel work in higher education. (Originally published in 1949) In G..L. Saddlemire and A.L. Rentz (Eds.), Student Affairs: A profession's heritage. Alexandria, VA: ACPA.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Borland, D.T. (1977). Aggressive neglect, matrix organization, and student development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 35-39.

Borland, D.T. (1980). Organization development: A professional imperative. In D.G. Creamer (Ed.), Student development in higher education: Theories, practices, and future directions (pp. 205-227). Carbondale, IL.: ACPA Media.

Boyer, R., & Crockett, C. (Eds.). (1973). [special issue]. Journal of Higher Education, 44.

Brouwer, P.J. (1949). Student personnel services in general education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Brown, R.D., & Barr, M.J. (1990). Student development: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In L.V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. 83-92). New Directions for Student Services (No. 51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burke, W. W. (1987). Organizational development: A normative view. Reading, MA.: Addison-Wesley.

Capel, R. B. (1987). The change process in developmental theory: A self-organization paradigm, part 2. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 100-104.

Carter, D.J. (1990). Racial and ethnic trends in college participation: 1976-1988. ACE Research Briefs, 1, 1-6.

Cheatham, H. E. (Ed.). (1991). Cultural pluralism on campus. Washington, D.C.: ACPA.

Clark, B.R. (1983). The higher education system: Academic organizations in cross-national perspective. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Conrad, C.F. & Shrode, P.E. (1990). The long road: Desegregating higher education. Thought & Action, 6, 35-45.

Conyne, R.K. (1991). Organization development: A broad net intervention for student affairs. In Miller, T.K., Winston, R.B., & Associates, Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 72-109). Muncie, IN.: Accelerated Development.

Conyne, R. (1983). Models for conducting student organization development. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 61, 394-397.

Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Student Development Programs. (1986). CAS standards and guidelines for student services/student development programs. Washington, D.C.: Consortium of Student Affairs Professional Organizations.

Cox, W.E. & Matthews, F.L. (1988, January 15). The best of times-the worst of times. Black Issues in Higher Education, p. 100.

Creager, J.A. (1968). Use of research results in matching students and colleges. Journal of College Student Personnel, 9, 312-319.

Creamer, D.G. & Creamer, E.G. (1986a). Applying a model of planned change to program innovation in student affairs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 19-26.

Creamer, E.G. & Creamer, D.G. (1986b). The role of leaders and champions in planned change in student affairs. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 431-437.

Creamer, E.G. & Creamer, D.G. (1988). Predicting successful organizational change: Case studies. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 4-11.

Creamer, D.G. & Frederick, P.M. (1991). Administrative and management theories: tools for change. In Miller, T.K., Winston, R.B., & Associates, Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 134-157). Muncie, IN.: Accelerated Development.

Crookston, B.B. (1972b). An organizational model for student development. NASPA Journal, 10, 3-13.

Crookston, B.B. (1976). Student personnel - all hail and farewell! Personnel and Guidance Journal, 55, 26-29.

Crookston, B.B. & Blaesser, W.W. (1962). An approach to planned change in a college setting. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 40, 610-616.

Cummings, T.G. & Huse, E.F. (1989). Organization development and change (4th ed.). St. Paul: West Publishing.

Daher, D.M., Corazzini, J.G., & McKinnon, R.D. (1977). An environmental redesign program for residence halls. Journal of College Student Personnel, 18, 11-15.

Davila, E.M. (1988, September 1). A bittersweet experience for Hispanics. Black Issues in Higher Education, p. 60.

Deegan, A.X., & Fritz, R.J. (1975). MBO goes to college. Boulder, CO.: University of Colorado Press.

Deegan, W.A. (1981). Managing student affairs programs: Methods, models, muddles. Palm Springs, CA.: ETC Publications.

Dilman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Di Tullio, W.M., & Work, G.G. (1978). Method and process - a management system that models student development. NASPA Journal, 15, 39-44.

Driscoll, A. (1990). Untitled comprehensive examination paper. Unpublished manuscript.

Ebbers, L.H., & Henry, S.L. (1990). Cultural competence: A new challenge to student affairs professionals. NASPA Journal, 27 (4), 319-323.

Edwards, A. (1983, October). The paradox for black students. MS, pp. 66-67.

Evans, N.J. (Ed.). (1985). Facilitating the development of women. New Directions for Student Services, (no. 29). San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

Fenske, R. (1989). Historical foundations of student services. In U. Delworth, G. Hanson, & Associates (Eds.), Student services: A handbook for the profession (2nd ed.) (pp. 5-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fink, A., & Kosecoff, J. (1985). How to conduct surveys: A step- by-step guide. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.

Fitzpatrick, M.M. (1988). Social responsibility in higher education. NASPA Journal, 25, 191-194.

Fleming, J. (1985). Blacks in college: A comparative study of students' success in black and white institutions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fleming, J. (1982). Special needs of blacks and other minorities. In A. Chickering (Ed.), The modern American college: Responding to the new realities of diverse students in a changing society. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Foster, B.G., Jackson, G., Cross, W.E., Jackson, B.W., & Hardiman, R. (1988). Workforce Diversity and Business. Training and Development Journal, 8, 38-42.

Fox, R. J., Crask, M.R., & Kim, J. (1988). Mail survey response rate: A meta-analysis of selected techniques for inducing response. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 467-491.

Foxley, C.H. (Ed.). Applying management techniques. New Directions For Student Services, (No. 9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Freeman, J. (1975). Women: A Feminist perspective. Palo Alto, CA.: Mayfield.

French, W.L. & Bell, C.H. (1973). Organization Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.: Prentice-Hall.

Glaser, E.M., Abelson, H.H., & Garrison, K.H. (1983). Putting knowledge to work. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Golembiewski, R. T. (1972). Renewing organizations: The laboratory approach to planned change. Istaca, IL.:Peacock.

Gray, J.L. & Starke, F.A. (1988). Organizational behavior: Concepts and applications (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Green, M.E. (Ed.). (1989). Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Gurowitz, W.D., Trochim, W.M.K, & Kramer, H.C. (1988). A process for planning. NASPA Journal, 25, 226-235.

Hall, R.M., & Sandler, B.R. (1982). The classroom climate: A chilly one for women? Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Hambleton, R. K. (1990). Educational research methods: Handout number 3. Unpublished manuscript.

Hammons, J. (1982). Organization development: Change strategies. New Directions for Community Colleges (No. 37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hanson, G. R. (Ed), (1978). Evaluating program effectiveness. New Directions for Student Services (No. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hardee, M.D. (Ed.). (1955). Counseling and guidance in general education. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y.: World.

Hardiman, R. & Jackson, B.W. (1986). Social oppression: An operational definition. Unpublished manuscript.

Harpel, R.L. (1975). Accountability: Current demands on student personal programs. NASPA Journal, 12, 144-157.

Harpel, R.L. (1976). Planning, budgeting, and evaluation in student affairs programs: A manual for administrators. NASPA Journal, 14, i-xx [special supplement].

Heller, S. (1990, October 24). Gay and lesbian studies movement gains acceptance in many areas of scholarship and teaching. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A4 & A6.

Hipps, G.M. (Ed.) (1982). Effective planned change strategies. New Directions for Institutional Research (No. 33). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Hodgkinson, H. (1983). Guess who's coming to college? Academe, March-April, 13-20.

Hodgkinson, H. (1984). All one system: Demographics in education from kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hodgkinson, H. (1986). The new demographic realities for education and work. Alden Seminar. Harvard University.

Hood, A. B. & Arceneaux, C. (1990). Key resources on student services. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huebner, L.A. (1979). Emergent issues of theory and practice. In L.A. Huebner (Ed.), Redesigning campus environments (pp.1-21). New Directions for Student Services (No. 8). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huebner, L.A. (1990). Interaction of student and campus. In U. Delworth, G.R. Hanson, & Associates, Student services: A handbook for the profession (pp. 165-208). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Huebner, L. & Banning, J.H. (1987). Ethics of intentional campus design. NASPA Journal, 25, 28-37.

Hurst, J.C. (1987). Student development and campus ecology: A rapprochement. NASPA Journal, 25, 5-17.

Hurst, J.C., Weigel, R.G., Morrill, W.H., & Richardson, F.C. (1973). Reorganizing for human development in higher education: Obstacles to change. Journal of College Student Personnel, 14, 10-15.

Huse, E.F. (1978). Organization development. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56, 403-406.

Iasenza, S. & Troutt, B. (1990). A training program to diminish prejudicial attitudes in student leaders. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 187-188.

Jackson, B.W. & Holvino, E. (1988). Developing multicultural organizations. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science and Religion, 9, 14-19.

Jackson, B.W. & Hardiman, R. (1981). Description of a multicultural organization:"A vision". Unpublished manuscript.

Jackson, B.W. & Hardiman, R. (1983). Racial identity development: implications for managing the multiracial workforce. In R.A. Ritvo and A. G. Sargent (Eds.), The NTL Managers' Handbook (pp. 107-119). Arlington, VA: NTL Institute.

Jackson, B.W. & Hardiman, R. (1986). Oppression: Conceptual and developmental analysis. Unpublished manuscript.

Jacoby, B.A. (1991). Today's students: Diverse needs require comprehensive responses. In Miller, T.K., Winston, R.B., and Associates, Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 280-309). Muncie, IN.: Accelerated Development.

Jacoby, B., & Girrell, K. (1981). A model for improving services and programs for commuter students. NASPA Journal, 20, 51-64.

Jamison, K. (1978). Affirmative action program: Springboard for a total organizational change effort. OD Practitioner, 10, 1-8.

Jaschik, S. (1991, January 9). Colleges fear debate on minority scholarships may fuel racial tension. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1 & A32.

Kalsbeck, D. H. (1989). Managing data and information resources. In U. Delworth, G. R. Hanson, and Associates, Student services: A handbook for the profession (2nd ed.) (pp. 493-512). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Katz, J.H. (1989). Facing the challenge of diversity and multiculturalism. In C. Woolbright (Ed.), Valuing diversity on campus: A multicultural approach (pp. 1-22). Bloomington, IN: Association of College Unions-International [ACU-I].

Katz, J.H., & Miller, F.A. (1988). Between monoculturalism and multiculturalism. Traps awaiting the organization. OD Practitioner, 20, 1-5.

Katz, J.H., & Miller, F.A. (1986). A model for developing culturally diverse organizations. Unpublished manuscript.

Katz, J.H., & Torres, C. (1985). Transforming organizations into functionally multicultural systems. In D. Vails-Weber & Potts (Eds.), Sunrise Seminars (pp. 32-33). Rosslyn, VA: NTL.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

Kuh, G.D. (Ed.) (1983). Understanding student affairs organizations. New Directions for Student Services (No. 23.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kuh, G. D. (Ed.) (1979). Evaluation in student affairs. Cincinnati, OH.: ACPA Media Board.

Kurpius, D.J. (1980). Organization Development, systems analysis, and planned change. In C.H. Foxley (Ed.). Applying Management Techniques (pp. 11-26). New Directions for Student Services (No. 9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lake, D. G. & Callahan, D. M. (1971). Entering and intervening in schools. In R. A. Schmuck and M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization Development in Schools (pp.139-153). Palo Alto, CA.: National Press Books.

Lawrence, C.R. (1989, October 25). The debate over placing limits on racist speech must not ignore the damage it does to its victims. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B1-B3.

Levine, A. & Associates (1989). Shaping higher education's future: Demographic realities and opportunities, 1990-2000. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. (1936). Principles of topological psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Linsky, A. (1975). Stimulating responses to mailed questionnaires: A review. Public Opinion Quarterly, 38, 82-101.

Lipsetz, A. H. (1973). Student personnel work and organization development. NASPA Journal, 11, 36-40.

Lyddon, W.J. (1990). First- and second-order change: Implications for rationalist and constructivist cognitive therapies. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 122-127.

Magner, D. K. (1990, January 10). Panel calls for radical changes in schools to improve education for minority groups. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A1 & A35.

Magner, D. K. (1991, February 27). Wisconsin struggles in effort to recruit minority students. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A27 & A28.

Mangan, K. S. (1991, March 6). Colleges offer cultural awareness programs to help professors understand needs of minority students. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A11 & A12.

Manning, K. & Coleman-Boatwright, P. (1991). Student affairs initiatives toward a multicultural university. Journal of College Student Development, 32, 367-374.

Martorana, S. & Kuhns, E. (1975). Managing academic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McDaniel, R. R., Jr., (1972). Organization theory and the preparation of student personnel workers. NASPA Journal, 10, 101-105.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (1984). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Miller, T.K. & Prince, J.S. (1976). The future of student affairs: A guide to student development for tomorrow's higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Minority students on both black, white campuses found to feel alienated. (1991, January 9). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A2.

Moore, L.V. & Shang, P. (1990). Applying cultural theory: The environmental variable. In L.V. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students (pp. 73-82). New Directions for Student Services (No. 51). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan (1986). Images of Organization. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage. National Center for Education Statistics. (1988). Digest of educational statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

O'Gorman, J. & Sandler, B.R. (1989). Peer harassment: Hassles for women on campus. Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Owens, H. F., Whitten, C.H., & Bailey, W.R. (Eds.). (1982). College student personnel administration: An anthology. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.

Owens, R. G. (1987). Organization behavior in education, (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Patrick, J. & Niles, S.G. (1988). Establishing accountability and evaluation procedures in student affairs offices. NASPA Journal, 25, 291-296.

Peterson, M. (1975). Implications of the new management technology. NASPA Journal, 12, 158-171.

Pillinger, B.B. & Kraack, T.A. (1981). Long range planning: A key to effective management. NASPA Journal, 18, 8-17.

Ponterotto, J. G., Lewis, D. E., & Bullington, R. (Eds.) (1990). Affirmative action on campus. New Directions for Student Services (No. 52). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pope, R.L., Ecklund, T., Mueller, J., & Reynolds, A.L. (1990, April). Combatting racism in higher education. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association Convention [ACPA]. St. Louis, MO.

Pope, R.L. & Reynolds, A.L. (1990). An annotated bibliography of multiracial resources for student affairs administrators. Unpublished manuscript.

Priest, D.M., Alphenaar, W.J., & Boer, W.J. (1980). Long-range planning: Implications and applications for the chief student personal administrator. NASPA Journal, 18, 2-7.

Racippo, V.C. & Foxley, C.H. (1980). MIS: A tool for planning and evaluation. In C.H. Foxley (Ed.), Applying management techniques (pp. 69-78). New Directions for Student Services (No. 9). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rappoport, J. (1988). Zero Tolerance. College Women, 12, 6-8.

Reynolds, A.L., Lustgraaf, M. Bogar, C.B. (1989, January). Institutional responses to campus violence. ACPA Developments, p. 4.

Reynolds, A.L., Roark, M., Shang, P., & Stevens, M. (1988, November). Incidents of campus violence. ACPA Developments, p. 7.

Rodgers, R.F. (1989). Student development. In U. Delworth, G. R. Hanson, and Associates, Student services: A handbook for the profession (2nd ed.) (pp. 117-164). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sargent, A.G. (1983). Affirmative action: A guide to systems change for managers. In R. A. Ritvo & A. Sargent (Eds.), The NTL Managers' Handbook (pp. 223-237). Arlington, VA.: NTL Institute.

Saurman, K.B., & Nash, R.J. (1975). M.B.O., student development and accountability: A critical look. NASPA Journal, 12, 179-189.

Schmuck, R.A., & Miles, M.D. (Eds.). (1971). Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, CA.: National Press.

Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). Black student on white campuses: 20 years of research. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28, 484-495.

Smith, D. (1989). The challenge of diversity: Involvement or alienation in the academy? ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports (Number 5). Washington, D.C.

Strange, C.C. (1991). Managing college environments: Theory and practice. In Miller, T.K., Winston, R.B., & Associates, Administration and leadership in student affairs: Actualizing student development in higher education (2nd ed.) (pp. 158-199). Muncie, IN.: Accelerated Development.

Steele, S. (1989, February). The recoloring of campus life. Harper's Magazine.

Stewart, J.B. (1991). Planning for cultural diversity: A case study. In H.C. Cheatham (Ed.), Cultural pluralism on campus. Washington, D.C.: ACPA Media.

Strange, C.C. (1981). Organizational barriers to student development. NASPA Journal, 19, 12-20.

Strong, L.J. (1988, December). Multiculturalism as a management style. Toward a new method of supervision. Profile NACA, pp. 1-7.

Terrell, M.C. (1988). Racism: Undermining higher education. NASPA, 26, 82-84.

Tichy, N. (1983). Managing strategic change: Technical, political, and cultural dynamics. New York: John Wiley.

Trembley, E.L. & Sharf, R.S. (1975). Accountability strategies for student affairs. NASPA Journal, 12, 249-256.

Varney, G. H. (1982). Organization development: Unanswered questions. In J. Hammons (Ed.), Organization development: Change strategies (pp. 45-54). New Directions for Community colleges (No. 37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1949). General System Theory. New York: Braziler.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE). (1973). The ecosystem model: Designing campus environments. Boulder, CO.: Author.

Wilson, R. (1991, March 20). In debate on campus free speech, panelist consider wisdom of colleges' policies to fight harassment. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A35-A36.

Wise, W. M. (1968). The politics of the private college: An inquiry into the process of collegiate government. New Haven, CT.: Hasen Foundation.

Wong, J. (1990, September 19). Conservative scholars see 'multiculturalism' as a plague. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A41.

Woodman, R.W. & Muse, W.V. (1982). Organization development in the profit sector: Lessons learned. In J. Hammons (Ed.), Organization development change strategies (pp. 23-44). New Directions for Community Colleges (No. 37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woolbright, C. (Ed.). (1989). Valuing diversity on campus: A multicultural approach. Bloomington, IN: Association of College Unions-International [ACU-I].

Wright, D.J. (Ed.). (1987). Responding to the needs of today's minority students. New Directions for Student Services (No. 38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL INTERVENTIONS CURRENTLY USED BY STUDENT AFFAIRS DIVISIONS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please check the appropriate line or fill in the appropriate information. *Note: by multicultural change efforts we mean all those events, services, programs, activities, brochures, offices, policies, procedures, etc. that are specifically designed to address racial issues or concerns or the needs of people of color (African-American, Asian-American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American) at all levels of the institutions (students, staff, and/or faculty).*

Thank you for your assistance with this important project!

A. YOUR INSTITUTION

1. State in which your institution is located_____

2. Institution enrollment:_____

   Size of undergraduate enrollment:_____

3. Of the undergraduate enrollment, what percentage of the students are:

African-American	_____%	American Indian	_____%	Foreign National	_____%
Asian-American	_____%	Caucasian-American	_____%		
Hispanic/Latino-American	_____%	Other	_____%		

4. Does your institution have a violence policy that specifically addresses bias-related violence (e.g., an "ethnoviolence" policy)?

   Yes_____ No_____

B. YOUR DIVISION

5. Size of student affairs professional staff (number of employees **excluding** undergraduate, clerical, maintenance, etc.)

   _____

6. Of the student affairs professional staff, what number of the employees are:

African-American	_____	American Indian	_____	Foreign National	_____
Asian-American	_____	Caucasian-American	_____		
Hispanic/Latino-American	_____	Other	_____		

7. Of the professional positions within the student affairs division, do any have **primary** responsibility (i.e., spend at least 75% of their time) for addressing the needs of students of color and/or multicultural issues?

   Yes_____ No_____

   If yes, indicate the number _____; Title of the highest level with this responsibility _____

   _____

8. Number of departments/units within the student affairs division (e.g., residence life, counseling services, financial aid, etc.) _____

9. a. Do individual departments/units within student affairs have **mission statements or statements of purpose** that directly address multicultural issues/concerns?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

If yes, indicate the number of such departments _____

b. Do individual departments/units within the student affairs division have **goals or objectives** that directly address multicultural issues/concerns?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

If yes, indicate the number of such departments_____

c. Do individual departments/units within the student affairs division have **professional staff selection criteria** that directly address candidates' effectiveness in responding to multicultural issues/concerns?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

If yes, indicate the number of such departments_____

d. Do individual departments/units within the student affairs division have **professional staff performance evaluation criteria** that directly address staff members' effectiveness in responding to multicultural issues/concerns?

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

If yes, indicate the number of such departments_____

10. Which of the following division-wide student affairs statements contain a specific reference to multicultural issues?

mission statement	Yes	No
goals & objectives	Yes____	No____
selection criteria	Yes____	No____
evaluation criteria	Yes____	No____

C. CHANGE EFFORTS

11. Have multicultural change efforts (see definition in instructions) occurred on your campus within the past two years?

Yes_____ No_____

12. The multicultural change efforts are focused primarily on (rank the following programming goals with 1 being the most important and 3 being the least important):

providing information (i.e., offers information about various people of color groups; e.g., status of civil rights for African-Americans, health care issues for Chicanos). _____

changing the feelings and values of the participants (i.e., makes effort to improve an acceptance of difference between people). _____

changing the participants and their world view (i.e., attempts to challenge and change the way individuals perceive the world and each other). _____

no such programs _____

13. In the two past years, the student affairs division has initiated approximately _____ multicultural change efforts (please fill in the appropriate number).

14. In the past two years, the student affairs division has sponsored short racial awareness workshops (e.g., workshops providing information about the culture and values of people of color; discussions of communicating across racial differences, workshops defining racism, etc).

Yes_____ No_____

15. The student affairs division has developed written recruitment plans to increase the number of people of color on the staff.

Yes_____ No_____

16. Each student affairs unit (department) has a specifically stated goal of increasing the number of people of color on its staff.

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

17. The retention rate within the student affairs division is about the same for staff of color and white staff.

Strongly Disagree_____ Disagree_____ Agree_____ Strongly Agree_____

18. Please rank the following goals in your efforts to recruit people of color (mark a 1 for the most important and 4 for the least important goal):

complying with affirmative action guidelines _____

increasing the number of role models for the students of color on campus _____

adding a diversity of perspectives and experiences to the division _____

other (please specify _____) _____

19. The annual student affairs budget has at least one line item designated to address multicultural issues.

Yes_____ No_____

20. All of the directors of the various units in the student affairs division have a responsibility to respond to the needs of students of color.

Yes_____ No_____

21. All of the directors of the various units in the student affairs division are held accountable for responding to the needs of students of color.

Yes_____ No_____

22. Budget allocations for all of the various units in student affairs are determined, at least in part, on the units' efforts to respond to the needs of students of color.

Yes_____ No_____

23. When the student affairs division makes annual budget allocations for each student affairs unit the multicultural change efforts of that unit are specifically factored into the decision.

Yes_____ No_____

24. Performance appraisals occur within the student affairs division at least once a year.

Yes_____ No_____

25. All student affairs staff are expected to demonstrate multicultural competencies as a part of their performance appraisal.

Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

26. The student affairs division has specific **policies** which address multicultural issues (e.g., require professional staff to do a specific amount of multicultural programming).

Strongly_____ Disagree_____ Agree_____ Strongly_____
Disagree Agree

27. The student affairs division has specific **procedures** which address multicultural issues (e.g., specific recruiting procedures in place to increase the number of RAs of color).

Strongly_____ Disagree_____ Agree_____ Strongly_____
Disagree Agree

28. The student affairs division on my campus has conducted an extensive, system-wide needs assessment of the needs of **students of color** within the past two years.

Yes_____ No_____

29. The student affairs division on my campus has conducted an extensive, system-wide needs assessment of the needs of **staff of color** within the past two years.

Yes_____ No_____

30. In my opinion, in order to respond effectively to multicultural issues at the student affairs division level, the primary focus of the multicultural efforts should be on **adding programs and services** to respond to needs not currently being met by student affairs.

Strongly_____ Disagree_____ Agree_____ Strongly_____
Disagree Agree

31. Programs and services have been added to the student affairs division on my campus to respond to multicultural issues.

Yes_____ No_____

32. In my opinion, the primary focus of the multicultural efforts should be on **restructuring the entire student affairs division** to respond to needs not currently being met by student affairs.

Strongly_____ Disagree_____ Agree_____ Strongly_____
Disagree Agree

33. The student affairs division on my campus has been significantly restructured to respond to multicultural issues.

Yes_____ No_____

34. The primary target (at whom the intervention is aimed) of the majority of the multicultural interventions within student affairs is: (Please **check** one response ONLY)

individual (student or staff member) _____

group (student group, staff unit or department) _____

entire division _____

35. **At the individual level** (e.g., an individual student or staff member), the primary purpose of most of the multicultural interventions is to (Please rank the following statements with a 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important):

provide information on/about people of color _____

examine prejudice or bias _____

examine underlying values or beliefs _____

create an internal paradigm shift _____

36. **At the group level** (e.g., student government, residence hall floor, unit or department staff, etc.), the primary purpose of most of the multicultural interventions is to (Please rank the following statements with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important):

increase the numbers of students and staff of color _____

retain the students and staff of color _____

focus on group dynamics and issues _____

restructure the core values and practices of the group _____

37. **At the division level** (including all student affairs units or departments), the primary purpose of most of the multicultural interventions is to (Please rank the following statements with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important):

raise student awareness of multicultural issues and concerns _____

develop an ongoing multicultural training program for student affairs staff _____

restructure the core values and practices of the student affairs division _____

integrate multicultural issues systemically into all aspects of the division _____

Please complete the following questions.

38. To make my campus a more multicultural environment I would like to **(please use back of this page and/or attach a sheet of paper if additional space is needed).**

39. Other thoughts, comments, or suggestions you would like to share **(please use back of this page and/or attach a sheet of paper if additional space is needed).**

ONCE AGAIN, THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS SURVEY!